



THE LEVITICAL PRIESTS.

In crown 8vo,

OUTLINES OF HEBREW GRAMMAR.

BY

GUSTAVUS BICKELL, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT INNSBRUCK.

Revised by the Author, and Annotated by the Translator,

SAMUEL IVES CURTISS, JR.,

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY, LEIPZIG.

With a Lithographic Table of Semitic Characters

BY DR. J. EUTING.

THE LEVITICAL PRIESTS.

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH.

BY

SAMUEL IVES CURTISS, JR.,

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY, LEIPZIG.

WITH A PREFACE BY PROFESSOR FRANZ DELITZSCH, D.D.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
LEIPZIG: F. A. BROCKHAUS.

1877.

MURRAY AND GIBB, EDINBURGH,
PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

TO

WILLIAM HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, PRINCETON, N.J., U.S.A.,

DISTINGUISHED

FOR HIS EMINENT ATTAINMENTS

IN THE LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

PREFACE BY PROF. FRANZ DELITZSCH, D.D.

IF it be true that Deuteronomy regards all the members of the tribe of Levi as competent for the priesthood, then this equality in title is either the abolition of the former privilege of the sons of Aaron, or the endowment of the sons of Aaron with the privilege is the abolition of the former equality. The latest phase of Pentateuch criticism maintains the latter supposition. It considers the elevation of the sons of Aaron above the Levites as the work of the Elohistic legislation, prepared by Ezekiel, who, degrading the Levites (xliv. 9–16), assigned the priestly functions within the line of the house of Aaron to the sons of Zadok. According to this, the Elohistic Thorah, which comprises the main portion of the middle books of the Pentateuch, is post-exilic. If this is true, who else besides Ezra could be the author? From this point of view, the claim that God revealed these laws to Moses is only made to give them an authentic character, and is a fiction as well as the history of the consecration of Aaron (Lev. viii.) and

of the Levites (Num. viii.), and entirely without historical worth.

The author of the following work has made himself thoroughly acquainted with the writings of the chief representatives of this theory, and seeks by means of sober arguments to show—(1) that the history of the people of Israel, as it lies before us in the historical books, presupposes a distinction in rank between the priests and the Levites, which reaches back to the time of Moses, and existed throughout all the periods of Israelitish history; (2) that the post-exilic books are in no way favourable to the opinion that the priestly hierarchy is a product of the time of Ezra; (3) that Deuteronomy, where it treats of religious privileges, does indeed assign them to the tribe of Levi, but yet so that these privileges—without contradicting the older legislation, which Deuteronomy recapitulates in an abridged form, and accommodates to changed circumstances—may be relatively distributed to the sons of Aaron and the Levites. He shows—and this deserves special attention—that the post-exilic Chronicles contain passages which in a Deuteronomic manner entirely obliterate the distinction between priests and Levites, while other passages emphasize it.

It will naturally be expected, since I have undertaken to write this preface, that I should define my position to the question with reference to the Pentateuch. I will do so frankly, although I can give only a few hints.

In my commentary on Genesis, up to the last edi-

tion, I have defended the authenticity of Deuteronomy; and even yet it appears to me that there are weighty reasons for this, such as the psychological truth of the testamentary addresses, the freshness and richness of the Egyptian reminiscences, the freedom with which the speaker reproduces historical incidents, laws, and, above all, the Decalogue,—a freedom which is scarcely conceivable except on the supposition that the speaker was the lawgiver himself. I feel even yet compelled to hold, when I consider Deut. xxxi. 9, that Deuteronomy essentially belongs to those portions of the Pentateuch which were written by Moses himself. For if this testimony were fictitious, Deuteronomy would be a far more immoral fabrication than the pseudo-decretals of Isidore. That it was first composed in the time of Josiah, is read *into* 2 Kings xxii. *between the lines*,—since it is not contained in the text itself,—for the narrative presupposes that the book which was drawn from its hiding-place was of recognised authority (2 Kings xxii. 13; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 21). Nor can it have first been composed in the time of Josiah, since it cannot be denied by an unbiassed criticism that even Isaiah and Micah a hundred years before embody reminiscences from it in their prophecies. Only this is true, that the Deuteronomy which, with reference to xxxi. 10–13, has properly been called “the people’s book,” and which was, under Josiah, again brought to light, exerted a powerful influence on the life and literature of the people after its re-discovery. The contradiction in which the

utterances of this book seem to stand to those of the middle books of the Pentateuch, with reference to the Levitical priests, is indeed striking. But I am rejoiced that I can acknowledge that the investigations of my friend have persuaded me of the possibility of harmonizing them.

It will scarcely be possible to eradicate the ruling critical opinion that Deuteronomy was composed in the time of Jeremiah. But certainly it is to be hoped that the different schools will be convinced, through their progressive scientific investigations, that the post-exilic origin of the so-called Elohistic Thorah is a chimera. It is true that the pre-exilic literature contains only a few references to the Elohistic portions of the Pentateuch, but it is not true that it does not contain any. I perfectly agree with my friend, that Ezra as well as Luther was only a reformer, and no more composed the main portion of the Thorah, than Luther the Epistle to the Galatians or to the Romans. The so-called Elohistic language is ancient throughout,—there is no trace of the peculiar post-exilic forms and syntax; and a historical fiction which reproduces antiquity in such an original way, as the narrative of the consecration of the priests and Levites, is a literary impossibility. But, that I may escape the reproach of indulging in vague generalities, I will show from a single minute point that the post-exilic origin of the so-called Elohistic Thorah is imaginary, and, on further examination, dissolves like the baseless fabric of a vision, leaving not a rack behind. One sentence of

the book which lies before me (p. 111)—“We look in vain for the description of the splendid priestly garments in *Chronicles*”—prompts me to direct my attention to a single atom of this many-sided question.

It is known that four colours were used for the coverings and curtains of the sanctuary, as well as for the clothes of the priests. All the portions of the *Thorah* in which the four colours occur are Elohistic. If they had been written after the exile, it might naturally be expected that at least here and there, if not throughout, those designations of colours which occur in later periods of the language would be found, but there is no trace of these.

One of these four names of colours, תכלת (*techéleth*), *blue purple*, has remained the same throughout all the periods of the language. But the name of *red purple*, ארגמן (*argaman*), has been assimilated by the Aramaic language, so that it has been transformed into ארגנון (*argewan*), as if it were compounded with *gawna*, Persian *guna*, *the colour*. The Chronicler has adopted this word in its Aramaic form into the Hebrew (2 Chron. ii. 6). The *Thorah*, however, in the parallel passages (Ex. xxxv. 35, xxxviii. 23), and throughout, recognises the old Hebrew form.

The scarlet or crimson in the *Thorah* is everywhere called חולעת שני (*tola'ath shani*), and *vice versa*—in the laws which relate to the cleansing of lepers, and of those who have become unclean through contact with a dead body, where a strip of wool which is coloured with this pigment is intended—שנֵי הולעת (*shen'i tholu'ath*).

This designation, which is not only taken from the name of the worm, namely the insect of the *quercus coccifera*, but also from the intensity of the rays of light, and which is without doubt the complete and original designation, is exclusively Elohistic. In other places only שְׁנִי (*shani*) or חָלָעַ (*tola'*) occurs. The Chronicler represents the youngest period of the language, since he gives the Persian name of כְּרָמִיל (*karmil*) to this colour (2 Chron. ii. 6, 13, iii. 14).¹

The designation of the white vegetable material of linen or cotton with שֵׁשׁ (*shesh*) has also disappeared from the post-exilic language. The Chronicler uses in its place בָּזֶן (*bus*), Greek βύσσος (2 Chron. ii. 13, iii. 14; 1 Chron. xv. 27; 2 Chron. v. 12), and the author of the Book of Esther says בָּזֶן וְאַרְגָּמָן (*bus we-argaman*), where the older language would say שֵׁשׁ וְאַרְגָּמָן (*shesh we-argaman*), as in the Pentateuch, and also in Prov. xxxi. 22. The post-exilic language has, besides, as a designation for white linen, חָרָר (*chur*) and כְּרָפֵס (*karpas*); the influence of the Aramaic and Arian is everywhere evident, of which there is not a trace in the Elohistic language.

And how does the position which one assigns to Ezekiel, between the Deuteronomic equalization of the tribe of Levi and the Elohistic elevation of the sons of Aaron, agree with Ezekiel's banishment of all adornment of colour from the sanctuary, since simplification and prophylactic rigour are two of the most influential elements in the formation of the new religious and

¹ Comp., on the contrary, Ex. xxxv. 35.

political state which he has seen in vision? As he prohibits the priests from going out in their official clothes into the outer court, lest they should sanctify the people with their garments (Ezek. xlvi. 14, xlvi. 19), and as he forbids the priests to marry widows, except those of priests (Ezek. xlvi. 22), both of which laws exceed the Elohistic in severity, so he reduces the garments of the priests to linen, פְּשִׁתִּים (*pishtim*), with the exclusion of woollen. The traditional practice of the post-exilic age has accepted this word *pishtim* as the interpretation of the Pentateuchal *shesh*. But under *techeleth*, *argaman*, and *tola'ath shani* the Talmud understands coloured woollen yarn, so that the prohibition, Lev. xix. 19b, Deut. xxii. 11, with reference to the official dress which the priests, especially the high priests, wear during their ministry, admits of an exception (*Kilajim* ix. 1, compare Maimonides, *Hilchoth Kelē ha-Mikdash* viii.). This peculiar view, and such discussions as are found in *Joma* 71b, show how uncertain the post-exilic age was in the comprehension of those Elohistic precepts which have been made products of that age by modern criticism.

The following circumstance, since I am speaking of colours, also shows that Ezekiel knew the Elohistic Thorah, and that many of his literary peculiarities are derived from it. It is remarkable that neither the Rigveda nor the Homeric songs, nor in general the most ancient literature, anywhere praises the heavens on account of their blue. Even Philo, where he speaks of the four liturgical colours, says that hyacinth,

tcheleth, is a symbol of the air, since this by nature is black ($\muέλας γάρ οὗτος φύσει$). He doubtless means black in the same sense as when we, even now, speak of the black violet (*Ιον μέλαν*). The Holy Scriptures, however, of the Old Testament afford an expression for the blue of the heavens in Ex. xxiv. 9 seq., where it is said that Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and the seventy elders of Israel saw the God of Israel, “and there was under His feet, as it were a paved work of sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in clearness.” Here the colour of the pure clear sky is indirectly indicated as the blue of the sapphire, just as we call it azure, *i.e.* blue like the *lapis lazuli*. The use of the word **בָּשָׂר**, which the English translation renders by the word “body,” of the substance of a thing, shows the Elohistic character of Ex. xxiv. 9, 10. This use is customary in the formula **הַזֹּם הַזֹּה**, *the substance of the day*, which is equivalent to the expression “this very day.” This formula, which bears the stamp of antiquity, also occurs in Ezekiel four times (ii. 3, xxiv. 2a, b, xl. 1); and, more important still, the picture of the firmament of sapphire blue under God’s throne is repeated in the vision of Ezekiel, which, according to 1 Chron. xxviii. 18, is called the Mercaba vision, with an evident reference to the fact in Ex. xxiv., and to the form in which it is expressed.

The 24th chapter of Exodus forms the connecting link between the fundamental laws which the book of the covenant, *Sopher ha-berith*, contains, and

the construction of the sanctuary (Ex. xxv.-xl.), which is acknowledged as Elohistic by all. Critical analysis experiences no small embarrassment in this chapter. We merely urge here the fact that Ezekiel has read the significant 10th verse of the 24th chapter. Or shall we hold the very reverse, that the 10th verse copies the vision of Ezekiel? According to the criticism which regards the Mosaic sanctuary as a copy of Ezekiel's tabernacle, even this inversion of the relation is possible. But we hold it as absolutely inconceivable that the Elohistic portions concerning the tabernacle and its furniture should be a historical fiction of the post-exilic age.

How inconceivable this is, may be seen, *e.g.*, from Num. iv., where the way in which the sacred furniture of the sanctuary is prepared for transportation, and the materials which are used for the purpose, are described. The ark of the covenant and the veil are first to be wrapped in a covering of badgers' skins—perhaps better sealskins—and then in a cloth wholly of blue purple. The table of shewbread is to be covered with a cloth of blue purple, and over it a cloth of scarlet, and then it is to be wrapped in badgers' skins. The candlestick, the golden altar, etc., are to be covered with a cloth of blue purple, and over it a covering of badgers' skins. The altar of burnt-offering is to be covered with a cloth of red purple, and over it a covering of badgers' skins.

The utensils, the household furniture of the heavenly King who dwells in the tabernacle, all receive a covering of blue purple. But the table of shew-

bread receives two coverings, one of blue purple, and the other of scarlet, between which its vessels and the continual bread are laid. Scarlet is a symbol of the fulness of life, and indicates the gifts for the preservation of life, which Israel returns to their heavenly King upon this table, with thanks for His blessing. The altar of the outer court is provided with a covering of red purple, for purple is the symbol of royal majesty, and this is the place where Israel daily does homage to its King, with offerings of adoration and prayers for the forgiveness of sins, on account of the blood which is allowed to them as a means of atonement. The sins are more or less *crimina laesae majestatis*, and the forgiveness of sins belongs to the *regalia* of God. A covering of sealskins is laid over all the sacred vessels, only the ark of the covenant has such a covering below, and above a cloth wholly of blue, for the ark is the sign of God's presence, and this sign remains, without the upper covering of sealskins, during the wandering in the wilderness, and is to be distinguished above all other sacred vessels.

Whether one considers this explanation of the arrangement of the coloured coverings fitting or not, this arrangement is by no means arbitrary, but has its origin in ideal motives. And are we then to believe that all this was invented by the Elohist, by Ezra, since it could not have been by any one else, and assigned by him to the Mosaic age? Are we to believe that, for the sake of giving the new Thorah a Mosaic appearance, and thereby of duping his contemporaries, he wrote directions

which were of no use for the post-exilic age, in which the ark of the covenant no longer existed, and the vessels of the sanctuary no longer had to be borne about? Let no one say, in order to make the inconceivable conceivable, that he drew from tradition, since there is not the slightest trace of Mosaic tradition in the post-exilic age. And even if one were willing to represent one so zealous for the law as an unscrupulous forger, where could a pseudograph be found in the old literature with such an imitation of the ancient language, and such a retrogression into the spirit and circumstances of antiquity, as this post-exilic Elohistic Thorah?

Nevertheless, the new theory as to the origin of the Pentateuch is continually making fresh conquests in Germany. In contrast with it, this book will seem ultra-conservative,—more conservative than is necessary in order to maintain the character of the Israelitish religion as a revelation. Yet I think that there is far more reason in this ultra-conservatism than in the opinion which makes Ezekiel and Ezra co-authors of the Pentateuch, and thereby overturns the scheme of Israelitish history.

FRANZ DELITZSCH.

LEIPZIG, *September 24, 1877.*

A U T H O R ' S P R E F A C E .

THIS is emphatically an age of microscopic investigation in every department of science. Philosophy, which once turned its eyes to the heavens as the source of its inspiration, is now scanning the dust beneath its feet. While this spirit of exact investigation is worthy of the highest praise, there is danger lest, in overestimating its importance, the faculty of generalization should be lost, without which all special investigations are of doubtful value.

The exegesis of the Scriptures was never pursued with such scientific acumen as now. The times of the childlike contemplation, which regarded the Holy Scriptures as a constellation which declares the glory of God, have passed from the schools,—the present age is engaged with their purely human elements. Or, to use a comparison which fails to express their divine character, it has ceased to regard them as the living man into whose nostrils God breathed the breath of life,—it is rather occupied with their dust.

The natural consequence of these purely microscopic and anatomical investigations is a growing irreverence

towards the Holy Scriptures among many critics. They subject them to as cool a criticism as if they were the works of a Milton or a Shakespeare,—as if no evil consequences could arise from undermining their authority.

It is often said that we have nothing to fear from the truth. But what is truth ? The attempted answers to this query mark the devious course of the history of philosophy, and show how hard it is for the unaided human mind to grasp absolute truth. If we were sure of finding it, there would be nothing to fear ; but experience and revelation show that the most precious truths may be lost when the human mind trusts too implicitly in its own wisdom. The sun may shine never so brightly, but it is virtually extinguished for us when we shut out its light and trust to our own.

It is affirmed that only a cool scientific spirit can serve in the discussion of such questions as the authenticity of the Scriptures, and that any other mood unfits one for weighing evidence. But I would ask whether a judge is less fit for his position because he appreciates the solemnity of a case in which human life is at stake, and because his voice, in pronouncing sentence of death, trembles with emotion.

Is there not, then, a something in the character of the Scriptures, in view of their past and present history, as the shrine of the holiest memories, as the source of the most sacred influences, which should remove all flippancy, all nonchalance, and should produce the greatest seriousness and gravity in their examination ?

If an apology were needed for a conservatism which might excite the contempt of some, or the pity of others, surely such considerations should furnish one of the most ample character.

It is claimed that Great Britain and the United States are far behind Germany in biblical criticism. While granting this, I trust that I may be pardoned for saying that which I have good evidence for believing in regard to England, and which I know in regard to America, that the Christian life in these countries, so far as human eyes can judge, is greatly in advance of that in Germany,—a life which, with all its Christian activities and duties, can be more directly attributed to the reverence which men hold for the Scriptures than to any other cause.

I would not for an instant deny the noble, conscientious, and truth-loving character of many of those exegetes who may call me ultra-conservative. I am confident, however, that if they could thoroughly appreciate the sources of spiritual and Christian life in England and America, and could fully realize the moral and spiritual dangers to which these lands would be exposed if the authority of the Scriptures were once undermined among the masses of the people, they would not for a moment condemn the spirit in which this book is written.

It may be considered an easy matter to withdraw critical views in regard to the origin of the Scriptures. It may be so for the critics. But when the people's faith in their authority has once been shaken, through the

unavoidable publicity of these critical discussions, it will be found most difficult to restore it.

Long-continued scientific examination, the sole companionship of like spirits, often unfits men for appreciating the consequences of a liberty in the criticism of the Scriptures, which, while perhaps not injurious to them, may offend many of Christ's little ones.

During the past year I have confined myself almost exclusively to my study. I have familiarized myself with the arguments of the new critical school. At first, the seeming strength of some of their positions caused me deep pain. In answering them, I have sought arguments which would satisfy my own mind, and have arrived at the deliberate conclusion that, while Dr. Kuenen's views, judged from a purely critical standpoint, solve many difficulties, they occasion, when subjected to a rigid analysis, still greater ones,—to say nothing of their degrading the Scriptures from their high position of authority to the level of other books.

I therefore simply ask my continental readers to regard this work as at least the product of convictions, of industry, and research. I believe that it will interest not only the specialists and clergy in Great Britain and my own country, but also the intelligent laymen, so worthily represented by such men as John Selden, who, notwithstanding the cares incident to his life as a historian, jurist, and statesman, found time to write treatises which were unsurpassed by his con-

temporaries in thoroughness and rabbinical learning.¹ I believe that such laymen, and those of lesser attainments, will take a lively interest in this book, if not on account of its inherent merits, at least on account of the unparalleled interest which the question touched by this discussion is now exciting.

In closing, I express my heartiest thanks to Prof. Franz Delitzsch, D.D., who has rendered me much assistance in the preparation of this little work for the press, and who has most kindly honoured it with a preface. Nor would I forget the readiness with which the publishers, Messrs. T. & T. Clark, as well as the printers, Messrs. Murray & Gibb, have responded to my wishes, notwithstanding great difficulties in the preparation of the fourth appendix.

SAMUEL IVES CURTISS, JR.

LEIPZIG, Oct. 4, 1877.

¹ The following dissertations in Ugolini's *Thesaurus* are from his pen:—*De successione in Pontificatum Hebraeorum*, tom. xii. p. 142; *De Diis Syris*, tom. xxiii. p. 2; *De Juramentis*, tom. xxvi. p. 584; *De Jure Naturali et Gentium juxta disciplinam Hebraeorum libri septem*, tom. xxvii. p. 472.

CONTENTS.



CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

	PAGE
Dr. Kuenen's Standpoint,	1
His Theory of Natural Development,	2
The Origin of Deuteronomy,	3
The Author of Lev. xvii.-xxvii.,	3
The so-called Middle Books of the Pentateuch,	3
The Chronicler,	3
Limitations of the Scientific Method,	4
Revelation and Miracles,	4
Kuenen's Canon,	5
The Bible from this point of view is a Tissue of Literary Lies,	5
Our Position,	6
The Question stated,	6
Our Method,	7

CHAPTER II.

THE ORDINATION AND DUTIES OF LEVI.

This Ordination did not take place at Jotbata,	9
Who were the Bearers of the Ark ?	10
The Priests bore it on Grand Occasions,	14
It was commonly the Business of the Levites to carry it,	14
Not proved that the Levitical Priests are designated as Bearers in Deut. x. 8,	15
Is standing before the Lord to minister to Him an exclusively Priestly Function ?	15

	PAGE
The Child Samuel ministered before the Lord unto Eli,	16
Passages in Chronicles,	17
Whose Function was it to bless in the name of the Lord ?	18
False Interpretations,	19
Duty of the Priests,	20
Summing up,	21

CHAPTER III.

THE INHERITANCE OF LEVI.

How shall we construe the Expression, "The Priests the Levites" ?	22
The Deuteronomist does not teach that every Levite is eligible to the Priesthood,	23
Priests Levites in Chronicles,	24
Shall we read Priests <i>and</i> Levites ?	24
The Usage of the Deuteronomist,	25
Asyndeton,	25
Reading of King James's Version correct,	25
Aaron and the Priests termed Levites,	25
Was Levi personally chosen as Priest ?	27
Some of the Modern Critics do not refer the Origin of the Tribe to Levi at all,	28
To whom does the Expression, "The Lord is their inheritance," apply ?	29
How was Levi to be supported ?	29
The Offerings made by Fire,	30
According to Leviticus, this Expression implies an abundant Provision for the Priests,	32
Not sufficient for the Maintenance of the Tribe,	32
God the Giver of Levi's Inheritance,	33
In what did the Inheritance consist ?	36
The Levites and the Sons of Aaron empowered to receive the Tithes,	37
Tithes partially designed for the Supply of the People at the great Sacrificial Meals,	38
Tithes in Deuteronomy do not exclude those in Leviticus—Numbers,	38
Alleged Unanswerable Contradiction,	39
What Levite may come with all the Desire of his Heart ?	45
What Service is intended ?	47

	PAGE
The Forty-eight Levitical Cities,	48
Does the Deuteronomist represent the Levites as poor ?	49
Is there room for more than one kind of Tithe in Deuteronomy ?	52

CHAPTER IV.

THE BLESSING OF LEVI.

May every Member of the Tribe exercise the Functions named?	55
Priests represent the Tribe,	56
The Speaker presupposes his Hearers' Acquaintance with Urim and Thummim,	56
Meaning of the word <i>Kohen</i> (Priest),	57
According to Deuteronomy, Eleazar succeeds his Father in the Priesthood,	58
It is Aaron's Office to bear the Urim and Thummim,	59
Peculiarly Sacred Character of the High Priest,	59
Functions of the Priesthood: Teaching, Judging, Burning of Incense (Korah), putting Sacrifices on the Altar,	61

CHAPTER V.

THE MODERN CRITIC'S BRIDGE.

“ Ezekiel the Bridge between Deuteronomy and the Middle Books of the Pentateuch,”	68
“ Levites degraded Priests,”	69
“ Distinction between the Priests and Levites,”	69
“ Ezekiel the Author of Lev. xvii.-xxvi.,”	69
The frequent Recurrence of the same Expressions in Leviticus and Ezekiel does not prove that they are from the same Author,	71
Comparison between Jeremiah and Leviticus,	72
Reasons for the Similarity between Leviticus and Ezekiel,	73
Style of Ezekiel radically different from that of Leviticus,	74
Two Branches in the House of Aaron,	75
Line of Ithamar cursed in Eli,	75
Henceforth they occupy an Inferior Position,	76
Who are the Levites mentioned in Ezekiel?	76
Exorbitant Tests,	77
Why does Ezekiel deviate so much from the Priestly Laws?	77
Character and Influence of Ezekiel's Prophecy,	77

CHAPTER VI.

JOSHUA—2 KINGS.

	PAGE
Effects of the Political Changes on the History of the Nation,	80
The Books of Samuel and Kings compared with the Chronicles,	80
Influence of the Period between Moses and David on the Priesthood,	81
The High Priests,	83
The Ephod,	86
Zadok and Abiathar,	87 ✓
Hilkiah,	88
Was it the main Business of the Priests to Offer Sacri- fices?	89
Levitical Priests in the Book of Joshua,	90
The Inheritance of the Tribe,	91
The Two Levites in the Book of Judges,	92
The Duties of the Priests and Levites according to the Book of Samuel,	93
Was Samuel a Levite?	94
The Levitical Cities,	96
The Levites are mentioned only once in the Books of Kings,	97

CHAPTER VII.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE CHRONICLER.

The Author of the Books of Chronicles,	100
His Authorities,	101
His alleged Invention of Levitical Genealogies,	103
Samuel,	104
Obed-Edom,	105
The Reason why the House of Ithamar is destitute of a Genealogy,	108
The Chronicler as an Arithmetician,	109
The Sources of the Post-Exilic History,	110
The High Priest,	110
The Sons of Aaron,	112
The Levitical Priests,	115
The Use of the word Levites,	118
The Chronicler as an Authority for the Regal Period, Colenso's Attacks,	118

CHAPTER VIII.

THE PROPHETS AND THE PRIESTS.

	PAGE
The so-called Antagonism of the Prophets to the Law and the Priesthood,	121
The Prophet's Occupation is gone after the Exile,	123
Joel manifests no Antagonism to the Priests,	124
Amos' Collision with a spurious High Priest,	125
The Reason for Hosea's Antagonism to the Priests,	128
His Use of the word <i>Thorah</i> ,	128
Is Isaiah a Collection of Prophecies ?	129
The Priests the Levites,	130
Zephaniah,	131
Jeremiah,	131
Explanation of vii. 22, 23,	133
Is xxxiii. seq. spurious ?	135
Haggai and Zechariah,	137
Malachi,	138
Does not allude to the New Epoch,	139
What does he mean by Thorah ?	140
Why does he not mention the Sons of Aaron ?	141
The Covenant with Levi,	141
Traces of Decay in Malachi,	142
His Teaching,	143
General Characteristics of the Prophecies,	143

CHAPTER IX.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF DEUTERONOMY AND THE MIDDLE BOOKS OF THE PENTATEUCH.

Brief Review,	145
The Deuteronomic Legislation and that of the Middle Books of the Pentateuch,	148
Who was the Author of Deuteronomy ?	149
Internal Evidence,	149
Moses' and Hilkiah's Claims compared,	149
Moses speaks from Experience,	150
Generalizations,	151
“ Moses wrote this Law,”	151
Ideas of Literary Propriety,	152
Critical Difficulties,	152

	PAGE
Was Ezra the Author of the Middle Books of the Pentateuch ?	153
Arabic, Christian, and Jewish Traditions,	153
The Ready Scribe,	161
The Development Theory,	163
When did the Middle Books of the Pentateuch originate ?	164
Deuteronomy presupposes a Code,	165
Harmony,	165
Tendencies of Modern Criticism,	166
The Loss of an Ultimate Authority,	167
“ My Words shall not pass away,”	167

APPENDIX I.

THE SOURCES OF THE CHRONICLER,	168
--	-----

APPENDIX II.

THE MEANING OF THE WORD THORAH IN HOS. IV. 6,	175
---	-----

APPENDIX III.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF ISAIAH XL.-LXVI.,	183
---	-----

APPENDIX IV.

The Text of הכהנים הלויים according to the Talmud and Massora,	190
Libraries visited,	191
Names of those who forwarded Readings,	192
The Massora,	193
The First and Second Hand,	195
Characteristics of mss.,	195
Method used in making the Collation,	196
Variations in the Text of Deuteronomy xvii. 9,	197
Deuteronomy xvii. 18, xviii. 1, xxiv. 8, xxvii. 9,	198
Joshua iii. 3, viii. 33,	202
Isaiah lxvi. 21,	205
Jeremiah xxxiii. 18,	213
Ezekiel xlivi. 19, xliv. 15,	213
Ezra x. 5,	214
Nehemiah x. 29, 35, xi. 20,	217
1 Chronicles ix. 2; 2 Chronicles v. 5, xxiii. 18, xxx. 27,	220
Notes,	227

INDEX I.

	PAGE
MANUSCRIPTS AND ANCIENT PRINTED TEXTS,	233

INDEX II.

NAMES AND SUBJECTS,	236
-------------------------------	-----

INDEX III.

REFERENCES TO THE SCRIPTURES,	246
---	-----

INDEX IV.

HEBREW AND CHALDEE WORDS,	253
-------------------------------------	-----

CORRECTIONS.

Page 34, tenth line from below, *read נחלה instead of נתלה.*

,, 59, fourth line of rem. 2, *read אין הסיד instead of אין הסין.*

,, 162, rem. 1, *read Sanhedrin instead of Synhedrin.*

THE LEVITICAL PRIESTS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

Summary: Dr. Kuenen's standpoint—His theory of natural development—The origin of Deuteronomy—The author of Leviticus xvii.—xxvii.—The so-called middle books of the Pentateuch—The Chronicler—Limitations of the scientific method—Revelation and miracles—Kuenen's Canon—The Bible from this point of view is a tissue of literary lies—Our position—The question stated—Our method.

THE author¹ of *The Religion of Israel*, at the very beginning of his work, clearly states his standpoint when he says:² “For us, the Israelitish is one of the principal religions; nothing less, but also nothing more,”—which, although claiming a supernatural origin, does not in this respect differ from Buddhism, Islam, and others, which claim to have sprung from a divine source. “If we look upon these other religions as so many manifestations of the religious spirit of mankind,

¹ Dr. A. Kuenen.

² *The Religion of Israel*, London 1874, vol. i p. 5.

are we not bound to examine the Israelitish and the Christian religions also from the same point of view?"¹

Dr. Kuenen consequently follows the principle here enunciated in the work just quoted. To him, the religion of Israel is nothing more than the result of natural development. He is to all intents and purposes a theological Darwin. The Israelites pass through various stages, from fetishism² and the grossest forms of idolatry to monotheism.³ With the greatest confidence he disposes of the historical records before the times of the prophets, or about the middle of the eighth century, as a mass of unreliable tradition,⁴ which has been committed to writing, has been changed and coloured until it bears about as much resemblance to the truth as a religious novel to the person who suggested it.⁵ The prophets are to him the only reliable sources of information.⁶ It is possible that Moses was the author of the Commandments, but it is not probable that they then had their present form.⁷ As for the Pentateuch, the patriarchs are not historical personages.⁸ From some confirmatory evidence, he is inclined to believe that the Israelites were slaves in Egypt, and were led out by a Moses, but in much smaller numbers than are given in the Scriptures.⁹ The twelve tribes did not arise from the twelve sons

¹ *The Religion of Israel*, vol. i. p. 6.

² *Ibid.* p. 270.

³ *Ibid.* p. 369.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 17, 18.

⁵ *Comp.* p. 23.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 102.

⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 283-285.

⁸ *Ibid.* pp. 108, 109.

⁹ *Ibid.* pp. 119 seq.

of Israel, but were formed by an admixture with neighbouring nations.¹ The twelve patriarchs were an afterthought, an invention of later centuries.² The book of the covenant, Exodus xxi.—xxiii., contains the oldest collection of laws. Deuteronomy was written in the year 625 B.C., perhaps by Hilkiah, as a reform programme, and was foisted upon Moses, although he was in no respect the author of it; nor does the material rest upon a reliable Mosaic tradition. Leviticus xviii.—xxvi. was composed by Ezekiel, the latter part of whose prophecy forms the connecting link between Deuteronomy and the so-called middle books of the Pentateuch, Exodus—Numbers. These form a programme which represents the wishes of the priestly party and the scribes,—a programme so cleverly planned, probably by Ezra, that it was a complete success. The prophet's voice before the growing legal tendency was hushed, and the many ceremonial observances so carefully described in the Pentateuch afterwards bore their legitimate fruit in the refined subtilties of the Mishna. Finally, this priestly legislation (Exodus—Numbers) obtained historical support by a “pious fraud,” since the whole regal history was re-written by the Chronicler long after Ezra, so as to illustrate the working of this legislation.

Such, then, are some of the results of scientific criticism as set forth by Kuenen and his school—results which would be appalling to those who consider the Scriptures as the bulwark of our faith, if they

¹ *The Religion of Israel*, vol. i. pp. 110 seq.

² Comp. p. 113.

were valid. They have, however, been reached by a strict use of the scientific method in its narrow sense. But this method, although excellent so far as it goes, is not adequate to settle the question. There are some subjects which, strictly speaking, are above scientific examination. Mere science as such, dealing with facts, cannot demonstrate the existence of God or of the human soul, since they are supersensuous.¹ But since science is limited by the powers of human investigation, their existence cannot be disproved. We cannot deduce God and the human soul by so-called exact science. When the scientist says that he only recognises impersonal force in the universe, he is quite right so long as he speaks from *his* scientific point of view. The mistake of the scientist is in supposing, on the basis of his investigations, that the revelation in regard to God and the human soul is false.

Strictly speaking, neither revelation nor miracles admit of scientific proof. Both are divine interferences in a development which had become abnormal through sin. The natural tendency of man is to a physical and moral corruption, which finds its antagonism in Him who is the Prince of life. While modern criticism regards miracles as an impossible infringement of fixed natural laws, those who have

¹ Haeckel, who may be considered as fairly representing the views of many modern scientists, says in *The History of Creation*, London 1876, vol. i. p. 32: "On the contrary, sensuous experience is the original source of *all* knowledge. For this reason alone, all our knowledge is limited, and we can never apprehend the *first causes* of any phenomena."

experienced the miracle of the new birth can accept the miracles of the gospel history, which culminate in the resurrection of Christ, as well as God's miraculous and providential dealings with His chosen people, which were the prelude to the execution of His gracious work of redemption. Kuenen, on the other hand, since he holds the modern views, lays down as one of the main canons of criticism, that we should not attribute a supernatural origin to the Jewish and Christian religions, any more than to the others which have made the same claim. Who does not see that this assumption must bias the whole investigation ? It eliminates at once theophanies, miracles, and prophecy so far as we understand by it the divine revelation of human events. But no one can find fault with the conclusions of the critics if he accepts their premises. If the Scriptures are not the product of divine revelation, graciously adapting itself to the unfolding intelligence of the race until in the fulness of time Christ came, there only remains the alternative that they are merely a record of human progress. According to this view, the Bible is a tissue of literary lies. The critics, under the influence of early training, may shrink from drawing this conclusion, but it must nevertheless be drawn. Of course, with the starting-point which has already been mentioned, the supposition that such passages as Deut. xvi. 2, which refers to a national capital, and xvii. 15-17, which alludes to the king, were composed during the regal period naturally follows. Indeed, the whole question in regard to the time when

the Pentateuch was written, and the way in which it originated, may be regarded, even before an investigation, as pretty conclusively settled.

As regards our standpoint, it may be characterized as the opposite of Kuenen's. We regard the religion of Israel as something more than one of the principal religions. We believe in its supernatural origin, in its vital importance in the scheme of redemption, and that God has given a revelation of Himself in the books of the Old Testament. Nevertheless, while we start with these presuppositions, we shall try to employ the scientific method, and give the objections which arise their full force.

The following discussion was suggested by a statement which we found in the last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*:¹—“And here arises the great dispute which divides critics, and makes our whole construction of the origin of the historical books uncertain. The Levitical laws give a graduated hierarchy of priests and Levites; Deuteronomy regards all Levites as at least possible priests. Round this difference, and points allied to it, the whole discussion turns. We know, mainly from Ezek. xliv., that before the exile the strict hierarchical law was not in force—apparently never had been in force. But can we suppose that the very idea of such a hierarchy is the latest point of liturgical development? If so, the Levitical element is the latest thing in the Pentateuch, or, in truth, in the historical series to which the Pentateuch belongs;

¹ See Prof. Smith's article on the Bible, in Part xi. p. 638.

or, on the opposite view, the hierarchic theory existed as a legal programme long before the exile, though it was fully carried out only after Ezra. As all the more elaborate symbolic observances of the ritual law are bound up with the hierarchical ordinances, the solution of this problem has issues of the greatest importance for theology, as well as for the literary history of the Old Testament." Briefly, the question is, whether we can accept Kuenen's results as substantially correct, or whether we may hold the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy as forming the complement of substantially our present books of the Pentateuch? Or are the prophets our oldest authorities for the history of the religion of Israel? Was Deuteronomy first written in the time of Josiah? was Ezekiel the author of Leviticus xvii.-xxvi.? was Ezra the author of the middle books of the Pentateuch? and has the Chronicler systematically modified the facts of the regal history?—these are the most important questions involved in the present discussion.

Our method will be to carefully weigh the arguments employed by Graf, Kuenen, and Kayser, and to find answers through our own investigations, rather than by a compilation or re-adaptation from existing apologetic works. Hence we think we can lay claim to the use of the original sources. We desire to do justice to those who, on account of their religious views, must be our opponents. We hope that these pages may not merely confirm the faith of many, but also persuade all earnest seekers of the truth that we may

hold that the Old Testament Scriptures are truly the record of divine revelation, without supposing that they have arisen in a way which would seem unworthy of their divine origin.

CHAPTER II.

THE ORDINATION AND DUTIES OF LEVI.

Summary : This ordination did not take place at Jotbata—Who were the bearers of the ark ?—The priests bore it on grand occasions—It was commonly the business of the Levites to carry it—Not proved that the Levitical priests are designated as bearers in Deut. x. 8—Is standing before the Lord to minister to Him an exclusively priestly function ?—The child Samuel ministered before the Lord unto Eli—Passages in Chronicles—Whose function was it to bless in the name of the Lord ?—False interpretations—Duty of the priests—Summing up.

KAYSER claims that, according to Deut. x. 8,¹ not only Aaron, but also the entire tribe of Levi were first set apart at Jotbata to priestly functions, —namely, to carry the ark of the covenant, to stand before Jehovah to serve Him, and to bless the people.² The first question which arises in the interpretation of this passage is as to the reference of the expression, “At that time.”

(1.) Even a superficial reading will convince any one that the author of Deuteronomy does not observe a

¹ “At that time the Lord separated the tribe of Levi to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord to minister unto Him, and to bless in His name unto this day.”

² *Das Vorexilische Buch der Urgeschichte Israels und seine Erweiterungen*, Strassburg 1874, S. 131.

chronological order. He speaks without premeditation, and mentions this or that as it may best serve his purpose.

(2.) The great theme of which he has just been speaking¹ is the apostasy of the children of Israel from God, when they worshipped the golden calf. At that time the sons of Levi showed the same faithfulness in a good cause² that their ancestor had in a bad one, when he received the merited reproach of Jacob.³

(3.) That such a connection with some previous narrative or with the thread of the discourse is not infrequent, appears from other passages in the Pentateuch.⁴

The 10th verse of Deut. x. seems to indicate that this is the right explanation of the connection. The Jewish commentators, Rashi, Rambam, Rashbam, and Spinoza, as well as the Christian, Ainsworth, Menochius, Tirinus, Munster, Vatablus, maintain essentially the same view. It will be seen that, as to the time of Levi's election, there is no real contradiction between Deut. x. 8 and Num. iii.-iv.

The question now arises: Who were the bearers of the ark?

Graf,⁵ by comparing this passage with Deut. xxxi. 9, 25, seems to consider it proved, as a matter of course, that the author of this book represents the priests as the bearers of the ark. Colenso claims that the

¹ Deut. ix. 8-21. ² Ex. xxxii. 26. ³ Gen. xxxiv. 25, 30.

⁴ Gen. xxi. 22, xxxviii. 1; Deut. i. 9, and often.

⁵ *Die Geschichtl. Bücher des alten Testaments*, Leipzig 1866, S. 42.

Hebrew participle in xxxi. 9 implies the habitual practice of the priests in bearing the ark, rather than an exception on the present occasion, as the English version, “which bare the ark,” might seem to imply.¹ The participle, however, is commonly used to denote continued action, either in the past, the present, or the future. The time must, of course, be determined from the connection.² Now, if Colenso thinks that the word **הנשאים** in this passage indicates a habit, he is mistaken. The participle is used, rather than the perfect of a relative clause, to indicate continued action; but the participle retains its verbal power, and is followed by the accusative **את-ארון**, so that Colenso’s rendering, “bearers of the ark,” is less correct than that of the English version, “which bare the ark.” It may, however, be suggested that xxxi. 25, upon which Colenso lays no emphasis, is favourable to his view, since the participle **נשאי**, being in the *status constructus* with the following words, has the force of a noun, and is in apposition with **הלוים**.

This is very true, but it does not signify that it was always the priests’ business to carry the ark. It simply indicates that on this occasion they were bearers of it.³

¹ *The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua critically examined*, Lond. 1863, Part iii. p. 556.

² Böttcher, *Ausführl. Lehrb. der hebräischen Sprache*, Leipzig. 1868, § 996, 2. Comp. Ewald, *Lehrb. d. hebr. Sprache*, Göttingen 1870, S. 437, 438.

³ Compare a similar use of the participle in Judg. iii. 18, where Ehud sends away the people, the bearers of the present. The rendering of the English version, “the people that bare the present,” is certainly correct.

The participle is used without mention of priests or Levites in 2 Sam. vi. 13, to denote the bearers of the ark; not as a professional designation, but simply to indicate those who were carrying it at the time.¹ It is certain, then, that Colenso's assumption in this case is unfounded, and that no grammatical necessity compels us to suppose that the priests were always assigned to this duty. Let us compare the following passages:—"At that time the Lord separated the tribe of Levi to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord."² "And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests, the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord."³ "Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord."⁴ Does this comparison establish the fact that the author of Deuteronomy considers it the exclusive business of the priests to carry the ark? So long as he has not said this in so many words, it is presumptuous to assert, on the basis of a single historical reference, that he meant to teach it. Suppose that the only reference in Chronicles to the carrying of the ark was limited to 2 Chron. v. 4, 5, 7: "And the Levites took up the ark. And they brought up the ark, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and all the holy vessels that were in the tabernacle; these did the priests the Levites bring up. . . . And the priests brought in the ark of the covenant of the Lord." If this were the only reference, we should have, so far as

¹ Comp. Num. x. 17.

² Deut. x. 8.

³ Deut. xxxi. 9.

⁴ *Ibid.* ver. 25.

Deut. xxxi. 9, 25 is concerned, a parallel case of the Levitical priests¹ carrying the ark. Yet there are other places which show that the Chronicler considered this the business of the Levites: "None ought to carry the ark of God but the Levites: for them hath the Lord chosen to carry the ark of God, and to minister unto Him for ever."² Hence we conclude that there is not sufficient evidence to prove that the bearing of the ark was considered a priestly function by the author of Deuteronomy.

There does not seem to be any ground for Schultz's assumption that Deut. xxxi. 25 indicates that the Levites are usually bearers of the ark.³ It cannot, however, be claimed that there is any contradiction between the two passages in Deuteronomy and Num. iii. 31: "And their charge shall be the ark." *Ibid.* iv. 15: "And when Aaron and his sons have made an end of covering the sanctuary, and all the vessels of the sanctuary, as the camp is to set forward; after that, the sons of Kohath shall come to bear it." *Ibid.*

¹ The Jewish commentators interpret 2 Chron. v. 5, 7 as follows: —Rashi says that the words (ver. 5), "*The priests, the Levites, brought them up,*" explain the preceding, which says, 'And the Levites carried the ark,' since it is there said who the above-mentioned Levites are; for also the priests are from the children of Levi, but the bearers were not real Levites." Kimchi remarks on ver. 4: "*And the Levites carried the ark:* In the Book of Kings it is said that the priests carried the ark, the priests carried it; and what here are called Levites are priests, for the priests were Levites; and our Rabbis say that in twenty-four places they are called **הכהנים הלוים**, and this is one of them."

² 1 Chron. xv. 2.

³ *Das Deuteronomium*, Berlin 1859, S. 71.

vii. 9 : "But unto the sons of Kohath he gave none, because the service of the sanctuary was upon them, which they bore upon their shoulders."

On occasions of peculiar danger or solemnity, the most sacred emblem of the divine presence would very naturally be borne by the priests. Such are undoubtedly those which are recorded.

The ordinary routine of the wilderness when the Levites were carrying it is, of course, not mentioned. This seems to account for the fact that the priests are almost the only persons who are spoken of as bearing the ark. When the law was formally delivered to the priests to be placed in the ark, the occasion was of sufficient dignity for them to carry it ; so was the passage of the Jordan,¹ the circuit of Jericho,² the curse and the blessing between Mount Ebal and Gerizim,³ and the removal of the ark into the temple of Jerusalem.⁴ It is not distinctly said that Hophni and Phinehas carried the ark in the battle against the Philistines, but the connection seems to indicate it.⁵ Certain it is, that when David was fleeing before Absalom, Zadok and Abiathar took the ark back to Jerusalem.⁶

Some might be inclined to draw the conclusion that these passages indicate that the bearing of the ark was a priestly prerogative ; but if they recall the passage already cited from *Chronicles*, and the occa-

¹ Josh. iii. 3, 6, 13, 14, 17. ² *Ibid.* vi. 6. ³ *Ibid.* viii. 33.

⁴ 1 Kings viii. 3, 6 ; 2 Chron. v. 4, 5, 7. ⁵ 1 Sam. iv. 4.

⁶ 2 Sam. xv. 29.

sions which make the act worthy of mention,¹ they surely cannot claim that this was a priestly function except on extraordinary occasions. Hence, when it is said in Deut. x. 8, "that the Lord separated the tribe of Levi to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord," we have no proof that Levitical priests are intended.

We have now to consider whether standing before the Lord, to minister to Him, was peculiar to the priests. Keil² asserts that it belonged exclusively to them. Indeed, it would seem as though no unprejudiced person could deny, especially after reading the passages which are cited by Graf,³ that the words, "to stand before the Lord to minister to Him," can be understood only of the priests. The matter is apparently so clear that we might pass over it without further comment, unless we should cite other passages which tend to enforce it, such as Ezek. xl. 46: "These are the sons of Zadok among the sons of Levi, which come near the Lord to minister unto Him;" xliv. 15, 16: "But the priests the Levites, the sons of Zadok, . . . they shall stand before me to offer unto me the fat and the blood,

¹ The only passage which mentions the Levites explicitly as bearers of the ark is 1 Chron. xv. 15: "And it came to pass, when God helped the Levites that bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord." Rashi makes the following comment on ver. 26: "And the children of the Levites bare the ark of God upon their shoulders with the staves thereof, as the Lord had commanded Moses. Our Rabbins prove from this place that the ark carried itself."—See *Wagenseilii Sota*, pp. 739–41.

² *Biblischer Commentar über die Bücher Moses*, B. 2, Leipzig 1870, S. 457.

³ Deut. xviii. 6, 7, xxi. 5; comp. xvii. 12.

saith the Lord God ; they shall enter into my sanctuary, and they shall come near to my table, to minister unto me." Colenso very justly observes,¹ that " the priests, the sons of Aaron," were to stand before Jehovah to minister unto Him, whereas the Levites were to be presented (Heb., *made to stand*) before Aaron the priest, that they may minister unto him, Num. iii. 6.

Without availing myself of the suggestion that the service of the Levites, as well as that of the priests, might be considered a service of the Lord, I pass to examine some passages which show that the words already cited do not apply exclusively to the priests. In all books in which the legislative element predominates, we shall find a clear distinction between the ministry of the priests and that of the Levites. This is the case not merely in Numbers, but also in the legislative portion of Ezekiel, where the ministers of the sanctuary, the priests,² are rigidly distinguished from the Levites, the ministers of the house.³ In the prophets there is no effort at distinction between priests and Levites ; the term " minister" is either simply applied to the " priests," or to the " Levitical priests."⁴ But can it be affirmed of any officer, besides a priest of the sanctuary, that he ministers to the Lord ? We have just such an affirmation of the child Samuel :⁵ " But Samuel ministered before the

¹ *The Pentat. and Book of Joshua*, Part iii. p. 457.

² Ezek. xlvi. 4 : מִשְׁרָתִי הַבַּיִת. ³ Ezek. xlvi. 5 : מִשְׁרָתִי הַמִּקְדָּשׁ.

⁴ Isa. lxi. 6 : מִשְׁרָתִי אֱלֹהִינוּ ; comp. Joel i. 13, ii. 17 ; Jer. xxxiii. 21, 22 : הַלְוִים הַכֹּהֲנִים מִשְׁרָתִי.

⁵ 1 Sam. ii. 18.

Lord ;” and another passage which shows how the Levites, in ministering to the priests, might be termed the “Lord’s ministers :”¹ “And the child (Samuel) ministered unto the Lord before Eli,” that is, he was a servant in the sanctuary ; for we read of his opening the doors,² to say nothing of his being, as it would seem, accustomed to be called³ by Eli. Now, if Samuel might be said to minister to the Lord, how much more the Levites in the regular service ! We are not, however, dependent upon such passages as the foregoing, although they may well command the attention of the critics. We have others in that book, which, as Graf affirms, always clearly distinguishes between the priests and the Levites.⁴ We do not refer to 2 Chron. xxiii. 6, where we read, “But let none come into the house of the Lord, save the priests and they that minister of the Levites ; they shall go in, they are holy,” although we must admit that this verse has some force. We refer to 2 Chron. xxix. 4, 5, 11, 12, where Hezekiah is said to have brought in the priests and the Levites, and to have addressed them : “Hear me, ye Levites, . . . be not now negligent ; for the Lord hath chosen you to stand before Him, to serve Him, and that ye should minister unto Him, and burn incense.” Of course the only reasonable interpretation which can be given of this passage, is that which we propose to apply to Deut. x. 8, 9, namely,

¹ 1 Sam. ii. 11.² *Ibid.* iii. 15.³ *Ibid.* iii. 5.⁴ Graf, *Die Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 44 ; and in *Merx Archiv*, Halle 1869, B. i. S. 73.

that in this address Hezekiah is speaking to the priests and Levites together as Levites. It seems also that this indefiniteness did not occasion any doubt in their minds as to their respective duties, since it is said that the priests brought out the filth from the inner part of the house of the Lord, while the Levites took what was brought out to carry it to the brook Kidron.¹ Certainly there was no impropriety in the Deuteronomist's speaking of the tribe of Levi as standing to minister before the Lord; and while he applied this with special emphasis to the priests, we may suppose that at the same time he neither excluded the Levites, nor was ignorant of the distinction between them and the priests, nor that he wished to destroy it. The citations from Chronicles certainly furnish the best commentary to this passage.²

It now remains for us to inquire whose function it was to bless in the name of the Lord. This seems to be the correct rendering of the passage, even according to the Septuagint.³ Castalio, however, renders it, "to

¹ 2 Chron. xxix. 16.

² Rashi understands the word לִשְׁרָתָה of the priests; Aben Ezra, of the priests and Levites. Ainsworth remarks, *Annotations upon the Five Books of Moses*, London 1627, on Deut. x. 8: "And as the Levites stood before the Lord, so they are said also to stand before the people, and serve them" (Num. xvi. 9; 2 Chron. xxxv. 3; Ezek. xliv. 11).

³ Καὶ ἐπεύχεσθαι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, the same translation as 1 Chron. xxiii. 13; in Deut. xxi. 5, εὐλογεῖν stands instead of ἐπεύχεσθαι. Walton translates the Greek in Deut. x. 8, *orare in nomine ejus*; in 1 Chron. xxiii. 13, *deprecandum in nomine ejus*. But ἐπεύχεσθαι may here have the same meaning as in Latin, *precari alicui (fausta)*, i.e. to bless.

celebrate His name ;” Luther : “ to praise His name.” Before deciding, let us examine the interpretations which have been adopted by Gesenius, Fürst, and Levy. Both Gesenius and Fürst¹ read “ to invoke His name ” in this passage, as well as in xxi. 5 and 1 Chron. xxiii. 13, following the analogy of קָרָא בְּשָׁם יְהוָה.² Levy reads : “ to praise His name.”³ If we were to accept these translations which I have just mentioned, the act of invoking or praising the name of Jehovah would be as allowable for the Levites as the priests. “ House of Israel, bless the Lord ; house of Aaron, bless the Lord ; house of Levi, bless the Lord.”⁴ “ And He appointed certain of the Levites to thank and praise the Lord God of Israel.”⁵ “ Then the Levites . . . said, Stand up, bless the Lord your God.”⁶ It is not our purpose to take advantage of a theory which might be made to prove conclusively that the Levites, no less than the priests, engaged in the service of praise, indeed that it was their legitimate business.⁷ We cannot, however, accept the interpretations of Gesenius, Fürst, and Levy, although so favourable to our theory, for grammatical and exegetical reasons.

(1.) It cannot be proved, unless in the three passages mentioned above, that בְּרַךְ is ever used with a following בָּ signifying *to invoke* or *to praise*. The object of

¹ See their Lexicons under בְּרַךְ. ² Gen. xii. 8, and often.

³ *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, Leipzig 1867–68, under בְּרַךְ.

⁴ Ps. cxxxv. 19, 20. ⁵ 1 Chron. xvi. 4. ⁶ Neh. ix. 5.

⁷ Compare Maimonides, *Hilchoth Kelē ha-Mikdash*, who applies Deut. x. 8 to the Levites themselves, and says : “ Some of them shall be singers, to sing daily at the offering.”

ברך is always expressed either by the accusative with נָתָת, or even without it, or the object can be omitted, as in the three passages in question. The complete construction is found in 1 Chron. xvi. 2 :¹ “And when David made an end of offering the burnt-offerings and the peace-offerings, he blessed the people in the name of Jehovah.” Now, since this construction of ברך with נָתָת of the object, which is sustained by the above lexicographers, does not occur anywhere else, we prefer to translate: “and to bless in His name.”

(2.) This translation is the most simple, and best represents the special duty which was assigned to the priests. All the people could call upon the name of the Lord, all the people could praise Him; but it was especially the duty of the priests to bless the people in the name of the Lord. But the manner of giving the benediction, so far as these words are concerned, is left indefinite. It is not at all indicated in the passages² quoted by Graf, which refer to a special occasion. The reference in Deut. x. 8, xxi. 5, 1 Chron. xxiii. 13, is to a duty which was performed by the priests whenever occasion required, and which cannot be understood without reference to the priestly benediction.³ That the duty of the priests is appropriately described in Deut. x. 8, etc., as “to bless in His name,” appears when we remember that in the benediction

¹ LXX. : Καὶ εὐλόγησε τὸν λαὸν ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου. The same passage occurs in 2 Sam. vi. 18; comp. 2 Chron. xxx. 27.

² Deut. xxvii. 12; Josh. viii. 33.

³ Num. vi. 24-26; comp. Lev. ix. 22.

the name Jehovah is repeated thrice. The priests emphatically bless in His name. It is not necessary to appeal to the almost universal support which the Jewish and Christian commentators¹ give this view, since it sufficiently commends itself.

Looking now at the verse as a whole, we find that it is spoken of a tribe which includes both priests and Levites, since the words are so general, that, with the exception of the last clause,² they can truthfully be applied to both, so that those who claim that any Levite might become a priest, must cease to quote this verse as a proof text, and must adduce other passages in support of their theory if they expect it to stand.

¹ *Taanith* 26b; *Num.* vi. 24, 26; comp. *Lev.* ix. 22. Rashi remarks on the words, “and to bless in His name:” “Priests, and this is the elevation of the hands;” Aben Ezra: “For Eleazar was raising his hands;” and מזורת דוד to 1 *Chron.* xxiii. 13: “This is the blessing of the priests in raising their hands.” It is also maintained by *Tirinus ex Bonfrère*, *Vatablus*, *Corn. a Lapide*, and *Ainsworth*. Jerome renders them: “ac benediceret in nomine illius;” *Munsteri Hebraica Biblia*, Basileæ 1534: “benediceretque in nomine ejus;” *Merceri Thesaurus Linguæ Sanctæ*, *Lugdunæ* 1576: “et ad benedicendum in nomine ejus.”

² Comp. *Erachin* 11a, which seems to indicate that both the Levitical service of song and the priestly benediction are implied in *Deut.* x. 8.

CHAPTER III.

THE INHERITANCE OF LEVI.

Summary : How shall we construe the expression, “The priests the Levites”?—The Deuteronomist does not teach that every Levite is eligible to the priesthood—Priests Levites in Chronicles—Shall we read priests *and* Levites?—The usage of the Deuteronomist—Asyndeton—Reading of King James’s version correct—Aaron and the priests termed Levites—Was Levi personally chosen as priest? Some of the modern critics do not refer the origin of the tribe to Levi at all—To whom does the expression, “The Lord is their inheritance,” apply?—How was Levi to be supported?—The offerings made by fire—According to Leviticus, this expression implies an abundant provision for the priests—Not sufficient for the maintenance of the tribe—God the giver of Levi’s inheritance—In what did the inheritance consist?—The Levites and the sons of Aaron empowered to receive the tithes—Tithes partially designed for the supply of the people at the great sacrificial meals—Tithes in Deuteronomy do not exclude those in Leviticus—Numbers—Alleged unanswerable contradiction—What Levite may come with all the desire of his heart?—What service is intended?—The forty-eight Levitical cities—Does the Deuteronomist represent the Levites as poor?—Is there room for more than one kind of tithe in Deuteronomy?

“**T**HIE priests, the Levites, all the tribe of Levi, shall have no part nor inheritance with Israel.”¹

Our first inquiry must be in regard to the grammatical construction of these words. Graf asserts that in this passage the word *Levites* is in apposition to

¹ Deut. xviii. 1a.

priests, and the expression *all the tribe of Levi* in apposition to *the priests the Levites*, so that the priestly functions are attributed to the entire tribe of Levi.¹ This construction undoubtedly has the merit of simplicity; as the text stands, it is the most natural. It is not true, however, that the Deuteronomist teaches in other places that every male member of the tribe of Levi is, by virtue of his birth, eligible to the priesthood. Not to speak of the Levites, who are often mentioned in a seemingly private capacity, there is in Deut. xxvii. 9, 14, 12, a clear discrimination between the Levitical priests, comp. Josh. viii. 33, as pronouncing the blessings and the curses, and their tribe, which has its position with Simeon, Judah, Issachar, Joseph, and Benjamin, and which with them are to respond to the blessings spoken by their brethren. The representation here, then, is that the mass of the tribe of Levi are standing upon Mount Gerizim while some of their brethren are acting as priests. Hence we must seek some other grammatical explanation of the passage in question than that which Graf has suggested.

It has been well observed, that there is a natural connection in the chain of thought between the king and the priests.² But as soon as landed possessions are

¹ Graf, *Die Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 42. Compare Kayser, *Das Vorexilische Buch*, Strassburg 1874, S. 187.

² Aben Ezra remarks on the words of *the priests the Levites*: “Since he has mentioned the judgments for the king, who is the judge, he also mentions the judgment for the priests, who are teachers of the law.”

spoken of, the tribe is suggested. This is undoubtedly the correct interpretation of the passage, rather than the view that the Deuteronomist designed to attribute the priestly prerogative to the tribe. How, then, shall we construe these words? There are passages where the connective entirely fails, and yet it is evident from the sense that the words cannot be in apposition. Such are Ezra x. 5; Neh. x. 28, 35, xi. 20. The last passage reads: "And the residue of Israel, the priests, the Levites, were in all the cities of Judah, every one in his inheritance." Now it is grammatically possible to say that *the priests* are in apposition with *the rest of Israel*. But an examination of the context shows that such a construction is absurd. It is evident from ver. 4 that we have to do with three separate classes, the residue of Israel, of the priests, and of the Levites, who went outside of Jerusalem after their brethren had been settled inside the walls. It is possible that the passage in Deuteronomy once read, "The priests and the Levites, the whole tribe of Levi," the second clause being in apposition to the first. The construction would be the same as in 1 Kings viii. 65: "Seven days and seven days, fourteen days." Although this reading with *and* actually occurs in one Hebrew and one Greek ms., it is not probable that it was original.¹

¹ The reading **וְהַלִוִם** is found in Kennicott, No. 69, a ms. of the fifteenth century, and **καὶ τοῖς Λευΐταις** in Holmes and Parsons, No. XI., Codex Basiliano-Vaticanus of the ninth century. These readings, of course, have no value except as indicating an exegetical opinion. Jerome translates: "Non habebunt sacerdotes et Levitæ, et omnes qui de eadem tribu sunt, partem et

This conjecture is, however, open to the objection that the Deuteronomist uses the expression *priests Levites* as equivalent to Levitical priests, and it is not probable that he has departed from his usual formula in this case.

There seems, however, to be no reasonable doubt that there is an asyndeton between the phrase ^{הכהנים} ^{הלוים} ^{כל שבט} ^{לו}.¹

If it had been the purpose of the Deuteronomist to state that any Levite might be priest, he would have done so more clearly than in the passage before us. It is his object not only to declare that the priests are without inheritance among their brethren, but that the tribe to which they belong has no inheritance among the other tribes. Hence, a connective may be mentally supplied before *all* (**כל**); and we have the ordinary reading of the English version, which undoubtedly gives the correct sense: “The priests the Levites, *and* all the tribe of Levi,” since the tribe is far more comprehensive than the Levitical priests. That Aaron and the priests in general are termed Levites, even where the distinction between the official character of the priests and Levites is observed, is apparent from many passages. Aaron is called a Levite.² The members of the tribe whom he is to employ in the service of

hæreditatem cum reliquo Israel.” The Arabic Version: “Cumque nulla sit sacerdotibus et Levitis, nempe toti tribui Levi sors aut hæreditas cum Israelitis.” Munster: “Non debet esse sacerdotibus Levitici generis et toti tribui Levitarum,” etc.

¹ See Riehm, *Die Gesetzgebung Mosis*, Gotha 1854, S. 35.

² Ex. iv. 14: “Is not Aaron the Levite thy brother?”

the sanctuary, are termed his brethren from the tribe of Levi his father.¹ His genealogy always appears with that of the tribe.² There is then nothing to prevent our assuming that the speaker embraces two classes, priests and Levites, under the designation tribe of Levi.

It may, however, be objected that in Deut. xviii. 5 it is plainly stated that God has chosen him, that is, Levi, out of all the tribes to stand to minister in the name of the Lord, him and his sons for ever. Compare with this, 1 Sam. ii. 28 ; Mal. ii. 4, 5. Do not these passages carry conviction to every reflecting mind of the soundness of Graf's position?³ Let us see. (1.) In Deut. xviii. 5, the word *him* relates to *priest* in the third verse. The latter is not, however, equivalent to tribe, since the two first verses of the chapter form a separate whole by themselves. (2.) The expression "out of all thy tribes" is the same as out of all Israel, and does not imply, as might seem, one tribe out of all the tribes, but a place or person out of all Israel ; comp. Deut. xii. 5, 14. "But unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes. . . . But in the place which the Lord shall choose in one of thy tribes" (xxix. 17, 20). "Lest there should be among you man, or woman, or family, or tribe. . . . And the Lord shall separate him unto evil out of all the tribes." In this case, "him" refers not to tribe alone, but also to all the preceding classes.

¹ Num. xviii. 2 ; compare Sirach xlv. 6.

² Josh. xxi. 3, 4 ; 1 Chron. v. 27-29 (E. V. vi. 1-3).

³ Graf, *Die Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 42.

We turn now to passages which are held by Thenius¹ and Kayser² to prove that God made a covenant with the tribe of Levi. With whom was this covenant made? It must have been made either with the tribe or with its representative. That God entered into a covenant with the patriarchs, which embraced their descendants, and with David in behalf of his seed, is familiar to all. Although 1 Sam. ii. 27, Mal. ii. 4, seem to imply that the covenant was made with Levi himself, this is not necessarily the case, for the term Levi is comprehensive like that of Israel. There is not a particle of evidence which shows that the Lord appeared to the father of the tribe. It was rather to Aaron, who became the representative of his tribe,³ to whom the Lord appeared in Egypt,⁴ he was chosen from among the children of Israel.⁵ Even with him it is not said that a covenant was made. Phinehas, his grandson, becomes the representative of the Levitical priests; with him God solemnly ratifies His covenant, Num. xxv. 12, 13a: "Wherefore say, Behold, I give unto him (Phinehas) my covenant of peace: and he shall have it, and his seed after him, even the covenant of an everlasting priesthood."⁶ With this compare Mal. ii. 5a: "My covenant was with him (Levi) of life and peace." But there is nowhere in the Old Testament any mention made of a covenant with Levi himself or his tribe.

¹ *Die Bücher Samuels*, Leipzig 1842, S. 121.

² *Das Vorexilische Büch.* S. 155.

³ Num. xvii. 18 (E. V. ver. 3).

⁵ Ex. xxviii. 1.

⁴ Ex. iv. 14, 27.

⁶ Num. xxv. 12, 13.

We turn now to the words, “they shall have no part nor inheritance with Israel; . . . the Lord is their inheritance, as He said unto them.”¹ I omit, as irrelevant to this discussion, the critical question with reference to the origin of the tribe of Levi, which, according to Vatke,² Duncker,³ Graf,⁴ Land, and Kuenen,⁵ is not to be referred to Levi at all. There is the completest harmony between Deuteronomy and the other books of the Pentateuch in the assertion that the tribe of Levi is to receive no inheritance among

¹ Colenso remarks on the parallel passage, Deut. x. 9: “The Deuteronomist, in order to have carried out properly the part of Moses, should have written, ‘Wherefore Levi shall have no part with his brethren.’ . . . It is plain that he writes from a later state of things than that of Moses, when the separate position of the Levites, as ministers of the sanctuary, was recognised in Israel.” This does not follow. The speaker has just mentioned that the Lord long ago separated the tribe of Levi to His service, at the same time He determined that they should have no inheritance among the tribes (Num. xviii. 20, 24). To the eye of the prophet, this was as fixed a fact as though it had already taken place. It is the perfect, which is usual for promises whose fulfilment is mentally already performed. Compare Ewald, *Ausführ. Lehrbuch*, Gött. 1870, S. 352; Green, *A Grammar of the Hebrew Language*, New York 1871, § 262 1. b.; A. B. Davidson, *An Introductory Hebrew Grammar*, Edin. 1876, pp. 115–6. The translation of the LXX., which the English version follows in this case, undoubtedly gives the proper sense: Διὰ τὸντο οὐκ ἔστι τοῖς Λευΐταις μερὶς καὶ κλῆρος. Holmes and Parsons, iii. xi. 30, 32, 46, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, 73, 85. Compl. Cat. Nic. Philo, i. 339, read ἔσται; Kennicott, No. 199, or Nuremberg 2, A.D. 1249, has הִנֵּה.

² *Die Religion des Alten Testaments*, Berlin 1835, S. 221.

³ *Geschichte des Alterthums*, Leipzig 1874, B. i. S. 358; ii. S. 133.

⁴ *Merx Archiv*, S. 75, 76.

⁵ *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, Amsterdam, July 1872, 628–670.

the other tribes.¹ Riehm remarks that the words, "Jehovah is their inheritance," which in the old law are only said of Aaron and his sons, Num. xviii. 20, but never of the Levites, in Deut. xviii. 2 seem to be applied to the Levites.²

This is not, however, a serious objection. It is not distinctly said in Num. xviii. that the Lord is their inheritance, but the twenty-fourth verse justifies the application of this term to the Levites as well as the priests, since the tithes which the children of Israel are represented as offering to God, He is said to have given "to the Levites to inherit: therefore I have said unto them, Among the children of Israel they shall have no inheritance." These words are certainly equivalent in sense if not in form to Deut. xviii. 2a: "Therefore they shall have no inheritance among their brethren."

The question now arises, How was the tribe of Levi to be supported? The answer is given in the most general terms in Deut. xviii. 1: "They shall eat of the

¹ Lundius, *Die alten Jüdischen Heiligtümer*, Hamb. 1711, S. 410, says: "The tribe of Levi is not reckoned among his brothers, when the inheritance in the promised land is mentioned, Num. xxvi. 62. But if the discourse is not with reference to the inheritance, and the tribes are otherwise numbered, Levi is numbered with them; and that the twelve may remain, Ephraim and Manasseh are reckoned under Joseph's name as one stem, as may especially be seen in Num. xvii. 2, 3; Deut. xxvii. 12." Comp. Delitzsch, *Commentar üb. die Genesis*, Leipzig 1872, S. 522. Comp. Num. xviii. 20, 24, xxvi. 62; Josh. xiii. 14, 33; Deut. xii. 12, xiv. 27, 29.

² Riehm, *Die Gesetzgebung Mosis*, Gotha 1854, S. 36.

offerings of the Lord made by fire, and His inheritance." Of course, the objector to the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy at once triumphantly lays his finger on this passage, as proving that the Levites, whether performing priestly duties or not, were maintained by the sacrifices.

It must be remembered that we have not to do with a clear statute, but rather with a statement, in regard to a tribe, which embraces a series of statutes, the knowledge of which is presupposed by the speaker. Indeed, there is no contradiction between the laws in the middle books of the Pentateuch, which only allow the priests and their families to eat of the offerings made by fire, and this hint at those laws, since here no distinction is made between the component parts of the tribe. If we presuppose the exact laws of the middle books of the Pentateuch with reference to those who have a right to participate in the portions which the priests receive in the sacrifice, we have no warrant in this verse for admitting the Levites in general to the same privileges. On the other hand, regarding this as an entirely new law, there would be need of much supplementary legislation to determine how the sacrifices should be divided. Singularly enough, the word **אשׁת**, or its plural,¹ which is translated in the English

¹ It is worthy of special notice that in Deut. xviii. 1 we have the expression **יְהוָה אֱשׁוֹת**, "the offerings of the Lord made by fire," the very phrase which occurs in the passages designated below, and of which we have no explanation except in the following passages: Lev. ii. 3, 10, iv. 35, v. 12, vi. 11, vii. 30, 35, x. 12, 13, xxi. 6, 21, xxiv. 9.

version the “offerings made by fire,” occurs only once each in the Books of Deuteronomy,¹ Joshua,² and Samuel,³ while it is found four times in Exodus, forty-two times in Leviticus, and sixteen times in Numbers. Is it not remarkable that, after the word had obtained such extensive currency in the priestly legislation, it should not once be mentioned by the priestly author of Chronicles, who, according to the critics, was saturated with the contents of Exodus—Numbers, which received their final form, as they affirm, at a time which immediately precedes that of the author of Chronicles.

If we were to consider Deuteronomy as containing full regulations in regard to sacrifice, we should have reason to fear that the priests were on the verge of starvation. But if we see, in the extremely meagre and scattered notices with regard to the priests and their duties, references to laws rather than the laws themselves, our surprise will not be so great.⁴ It is absolutely necessary, in view of the facts which we have cited, to presuppose as full a code of laws in regard to the participation of the priests in the sacrifices as we find in the middle books of the Pentateuch.

To these we must look for the explanation of the

¹ xviii. 1.

² xiii. 14.

³ ii. 28.

⁴ The terms **מנחת סלת**, **קרבן אישם**, do not occur in Deuteronomy; **חטאת** is not used in it of a sin-offering; **הלוּ** is confined to xii. 6, 11, 13, 14, 26; **זבח** is found in xii. 6, 11, 27, xviii. 3, xxxiii. 19; **שלמים**, **בליל**, Deut. xxvii. 7; **נדר**, xii. 6, 11, 26; **בליל**, xxxiii. 10. The contrast between Deuteronomy and the other books of the Pentateuch in this respect is very striking.

phrase, “the offerings of the Lord made by fire,” and not to ver. 3, which we will consider farther on. We shall find, by reference to the laws in Leviticus, that under the word *אִשָּׂה*, *offering made by fire*, provision was made for the nourishment of the priests. (1.) They received the wave-breast and the heave-shoulder of the *שְׁלָמִים*, *peace-offerings*.¹ (2.) The whole of the *חַטָּאת*, *sin-offering*, which was a female kid of the goats, or a lamb,² was given to the priests, with the exception of the fat, which was burned on the altar. (3.) They were to receive the whole of the *בְּנֵי אֶתְנָסָה*, *trespass-offerings*.³ (4.) They were entitled to the greater part of the *קָרְבָּן*, *meat-offering*.⁴ It follows from these regulations, that except in times of apostasy the existence of the priests would be secured. The offerings of the Lord made by fire, however, could not have sufficed to secure the maintenance of the whole tribe, or even to fully meet the most simple necessities of the priests; hence

¹ These were, (a) a male or female of the herd, Lev. iii. 1, vii. 34; (b) of the flock, ver. 6; (c) or a goat, ver. 12.

² Lev. iv. 27–35, vi. 25–29.

³ They were of four kinds: (a) for concealing knowledge, Lev. v. 1, the offering was a female lamb or kid, ver. 6, or if too poor, the man bringing the sacrifice could offer two turtle doves or young pigeons, or if these were beyond his means, he could bring a meat-offering, ver. 11; (b) for sacrilege committed ignorantly, he was required to bring a ram, ver. 15; (c) for sins of ignorance, (d) and for sins done knowingly, he was required to bring a ram, ver. 18, vi. 6, vii. 6, 7.

⁴ This was of four different kinds: (a) fine flour, oil and frankincense, Lev. ii. 1–3; (b) baked in an oven, ver. 4, vii. 9; (c) dressed in a frying-pan, ver. 7, vii. 9; (d) green ears of corn, with oil and frankincense, ver. 14, vii. 10.

a further provision is made for the entire tribe of Levi, who are to eat of the Lord's inheritance.¹

Before considering in what this inheritance consisted, let us ascertain to whom the pronoun *his* refers in Deut. xviii. 1b; examine some passages which mention the inheritance as promised; and find, if possible, the place to which the Deuteronomist refers in xviii. 2b.

(1.) To whom, then, does the pronoun refer in the expression "his inheritance"? Obviously to the Lord. The tribe is not only to eat of the Lord's offerings made by fire, but also of His inheritance.² Any other construction is unnatural.³

(2.) In verse 2b the inheritance is mentioned as something which has been definitely promised: "The Lord is his inheritance, as He said unto him." In Deut. x. 9b the words are substantially the same: "The Lord

¹ The Septuagint translates the phrase: *καρπώματα κυρίου ὁ κληρος αὐτῶν, φάγονται αὐτά*, which Walton renders: *Oblationes Domini sors eorum, comedent eas.* This omission of *ι, and*, by the LXX., which is supported by a German Hebrew ms. of the twelfth century, Kennicott No. 4, is arbitrary. The Targums, the Samaritan, Syriac, and Arabic versions, all follow the Hebrew *וְלֹכְנוּ*.

² In Maimonides, *Terumoth* xii. 19, it is said of the priests or Levites: "And so they were forbidden to seize the heave-offerings and the tithes, or even to ask for their portion, since they were rather to receive it with honour, because at the table of the Lord they were eating, and at His table they were drinking, and these gifts were the Lord's, which He had granted to them, as it is said, I also have given thee the charge of my heave-offerings" (Num. xviii. 8).

³ The Septuagint and the Jerusalem Targum translate: *their inheritance*. The reference, however, is to God as the giver to Levi of an inheritance which has first been solemnly bestowed on Himself.

is his inheritance, according as the Lord thy God promised him." In Josh. xiii. 33 the passage reads: "The Lord God of Israel was their inheritance, as He said unto them."

Now, in these passages the Deuteronomist and the author of Joshua have in mind some definite command of God, which they regard as well known to all.

(3.) Is there, then, any place in the Old Testament where this promise seems to have been made for the first time? There are only two passages where such a promise appears. One is in Ezek. xliv. 27b, 28: "He shall offer his sin-offering, saith the Lord Jehovah. And it shall be unto them for an inheritance; I am their inheritance: and ye shall give them no possession in Israel; I am their possession."

But it is impossible that the Deuteronomist should refer to a work which, as all the critics agree, was written after his time. Besides, the mode of expression is different, and renders the reference to Ezekiel improbable. The word *רֹכֶחֶת*, *portion*,¹ which appears in connection with *הַלְּכָה* in Deut. x. 9 and xviii., does not occur in Ezek. xliv. 28b, but *מִזְבְּחָה*, *possession*. If we now turn to Num. xviii. 20, 21, 24, we shall probably find the original promise on which the above passages rest: "And the Lord spake unto Aaron, In their land shalt thou not inherit, neither shalt thou

¹ Siphri explains this word: *part that is booty*. Rashi, Ramban, and Ainsworth adopt the same. Maimonides also, *Hilcoth Shemitta va-Yobel* xiii. 10, paraphrases: "Part in the booty and inheritance of the land."

have any part among them: I am thy part and thine inheritance among the children of Israel. And, behold, I have given the children of Levi all the tenth in Israel for an inheritance. . . . But the tithes of the children of Israel, which they offer as a heave-offering unto the Lord, I have given to the Levites to inherit: therefore I have said unto them, Among the children of Israel they shall have no inheritance."

It will be seen that in the above passage the words occur which are cited in Deut. x. 9, xviii. 1: "I am thy *part* and thine inheritance." But the objection has been raised by Riehm, that while the expression, "the Lord is his inheritance," seems to be applied to the whole tribe of Levi without discrimination; in the old law, as given above, it is said only of Aaron and his sons.¹

(4.) Let us then consider to whom the expression, "the Lord is their inheritance," in Num. xviii. 20–24, applies. We admit that in the passage quoted these words are used only of Aaron and his sons. When we turn, however, to ver. 21, and especially to ver. 24, we find it clearly stated that the Lord has given the Levites the tithes of the children of Israel, which they offer as a heave-offering unto the Lord, for an inheritance. When He gives these tithes, which He has received from Israel as His own, to the Levites, we have a right

¹ *Gesetzgebung Mosis*, S. 36: "Hiernach scheinen die Leviten an den Opferdeputaten Theil haben zu sollen, und auch auf sie scheint das 'Jehova selbst ist ihr Erbe,' das im alten Gesetz nur von Aaron und seinen Söhnen (Num. xviii. 20) nie von den Leviten gesagt wird, angewendet zu werden."

to affirm that the author of this passage in Numbers really represents God as the inheritance of the Levites, since the tithes belonged to Him as well as the sacrifices, and He is as truly represented as giving the tithes to the priests and Levites, as the sacrifices to priests alone. Hence the Deuteronomist, without any change in the terms of the promise in Num. xviii. 20–24, can say of the tribe, including priests and Levites, “The Lord is his inheritance, as He said unto him.”¹

(5.) The question now arises, In what did the inheritance consist? This is not defined by the Deuteronomist, beyond the general statement that the Lord is his inheritance. In the Book of Joshua, which some claim was from the same author, it is said, xiii. 14, that the sacrifices of the Lord God of Israel; ver. 33, that the Lord God of Israel; and xviii. 7, that the priesthood of the Lord, are the inheritance of the Levites. It will be seen that neither of these verses defines that inheritance, they merely contain general statements in regard to it. Certainly, if we were left to these notices, the terms of the Levitical inheritance would be very obscure. When, however, we turn to Num. xviii. 21, 24, 26, we find the tithes definitely mentioned as the inheritance of the Levites, while that of the priests, who belong to the same tribe, is defined in vers. 8–20.

We are at once met with two objections: (1) that Deuteronomy does not represent the Levites as receiving tithes; (2) that those mentioned serve an entirely different purpose from the ones designated in the

¹ Deut. xviii. 1.

middle books of the Pentateuch. The first objection, that the Deuteronomist nowhere represents the Levites as receiving tithes, is sufficiently answered when we remember that the scantiest mention is made of the priesthood and its privileges. It is certain that there were many things which pertained to them of which no mention is made in Deuteronomy. Indeed, the custom of arguing that a thing does not exist because at the time of a certain writer it is not referred to by him, is a curse to all true criticism, and cannot be too severely condemned. If we suppose, however, that the laws in regard to the first-fruits, the firstlings, and the tithes, given in Num. xviii., were already in existence before the composition of Deuteronomy, then no one who was versed in them could fail to understand that they were indicated under the term inheritance (Deut. xviii. 1b).

The second objection has more weight. In Leviticus the character of the tithes is briefly specified. It is taught, in xxvii. 30-32, that all the tithe of the land and of the flocks and herds is holy to the Lord. Emphasis is to be laid on the fact that the tithe is not the people's property, but the Lord's. Hence the Israelites can only dispose of it to those persons who were empowered to receive it for Him. In Num. xviii. 21, 24, 26, 28, these are designated as the Levites and the sons of Aaron. If we now look at Deuteronomy, we shall find that the tithes there mentioned differ entirely in character from those in Lev. xxvii. 30, 32. According to Deut. xii. 17, xiv. 22, 23, the

tithes are simply products of the field, or, more specifically, consist of corn, wine, and oil. They seem to have differed from those already mentioned as follows : (1) They appear to have been limited to three things, corn, wine, and oil, while those in Leviticus embraced all the products of husbandry ; (2) they did not include the tenth of the flocks and herds ; (3) they are nowhere characterised as the Lord's, but are spoken of as belonging to the Israelites, to be eaten in sacrificial meals, or as a tithe which is set apart once in three years for the benefit of the poor.

(1.) Now, when it is asserted that the tithes in Deuteronomy exclude those in Leviticus and Numbers, it is a great mistake ; since they served an entirely different purpose, namely,—with the exception of the tithe which was given to the poor,—of partially providing for the people at the great sacrificial feasts,¹ which, owing to their length and dignity, would require not less than a tenth of the year's husbandry. The expenditures for such occasions of mirth and festivity were much the same in kind as the modern Jews make every Sabbath,² or Christians at Christmas and the New Year. They brought pleasure to the giver and all his immeditate friends. (2.) It cannot be proved that the tithes in Deuteronomy exclude those in Leviticus and Numbers, — because together they would be too great a burden for the people. If we were to regard all the tithes as so

¹ See Deut. xvi. 2, 10, 13.

² Comp. Schröder, *Satzungen u. Gebräuche des talmud. rabbin. Judenthums*, Bremen 1851, S. 21.

many taxes, it would not be proved that, even in the regal period, when the people were required to give a tenth of their seed, of their vineyards, and of their sheep,¹ they were oppressive, since, except in the case of the priests and Levites, the tithes did not extend to everything, but only to corn, wine, and oil. In any case, all these tithes put together could not be as oppressive as the exactions of the Roman Catholic Church before the Reformation, or the Turks of the present day. (3.) The Jewish tradition, which in such matters should certainly have weight, discriminates the *מעשר שני*,² *second tithe*, and the *מעשר עני*,³ *tithe of the poor*, as quite distinct from that in the middle books of the Pentateuch. From all this, we conclude that the Deuteronomist in xviii. 1, 2 refers, under the term inheritance, to the tithes as described in Leviticus and Numbers (*מעשר ראשן* with the *מעשר מן המעשר*).

An unanswerable contradiction, however, is said to exist between the regulations as to the firstlings in Deut. xii. 17 and in Num. xviii. 15–18. This is not, however, really the case. It will be remembered in the so-called peace-offerings that the wave-breast and the heave-shoulder were solemnly set apart for the use of the priests after the fat had been burned.⁴ It is natural to suppose that the rest of the animal fell to the owner who brought the offering. This conjecture enables us to solve the problem as to the disposition

¹ 1 Sam. viii. 15, 17.

² Deut. xiv. 22–27.

³ Deut. xiv. 28.

⁴ Ex. xxix. 27, 28; Lev. vii. 34.

which was made of the firstlings. In Num. xviii. 18, the Lord is represented as saying to Aaron : " And the flesh of them shall be thine, as the wave-breast and the heave-shoulder, it shall be thine." But in Deut. xii. 17, the people¹ are addressed when it is said : " Thou mayest not eat within thy gates the tithe of thy corn, or of thy wine, or of thy oil, or the firstlings of thy herds or of thy flocks." It is not said in Numbers that all the flesh of the firstlings belongs to the priests, nor in Deuteronomy that the people are to eat all of it.

The promise is made to Aaron in general terms, that the flesh shall be his. The question would naturally arise whether he was to receive all of it,² as in the

¹ Rashi *in loco* : " This admonition is for the priests ; " and Aben Ezra : " He says this of the priests, for the Levites and also the priests are included under Israel." The connection, however, is evidently against this interpretation.

² The Rabbinical tradition evidently assigns all the flesh of the firstlings to the priests. Josephus, *Antiq.* iv. 4. 4 : καὶ τῶν τετραπόδων δὲ τῶν τις τὰς θυσίας νενομισμένων τὸ γεννηθὲν πρῶτον, ἀν ἄρσεν ἦ, καταβύσσαι παρασχεῖν τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν, ὥστε αὐτοὺς πανοικὶ σιτεῖσθαι ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ πόλει. " And they shall bring the firstling of four-footed beasts, which are lawful for sacrifices, to the priests to be offered, if it is a male, that they may eat it with the entire family in the sacred city." Mishna, *Bechoroth* ii. 6, where the question is discussed whether twin lambs, if both are males, coming to the light at the same moment as firstlings belong to the priest. The weight of opinion assigns only one to him ; but in case one of them should die, he shares the living lamb with the owner. If one of the firstlings, however, is a female, the priest receives neither. This tradition, however, is not to be received, unless it can be proved that Num. xviii. 18, in the Hebrew original and the Greek translation, affords no foundation for our explanation.

case of the sin- and trespass-offerings,¹ or only the wave-breast and heave-shoulder, as in the peace-offerings. The latter is the standard assigned. After the priest has offered the fat,² the breast falls to Aaron and his sons; and the owner who brings the offering, "with his own hands" gives the officiating priest the right shoulder, ver. 32. The evident inference is, that he retains the rest of the animal for his own use;³ so that both priests and, according to the passage in Deuteronomy, the people can partake of the firstlings.

We turn now to Deut. xviii. 3, which is considered by some as indicating the portions which the Levitical priests were to receive from the offerings, namely, the shoulder, the two cheeks, and the maw. This explana-

¹ Lev. vi. 25-29, vii. 1-7.

² Num. xviii. 17; compare Lev. vii. 31.

³ In Num. xviii. 18, בְּ is a preposition which governs הַיְהָ and בְּיוֹשָׁן, which therefore are not subjects of יְהִיָּה; its subject is "their flesh." The preposition בְּ here indicates agreement with a norm, as Ex. xxi. 9; Lev. v. 10, viii. 34; Num. ii. 34, ix. 3, 12. This construction is given by the LXX.: καὶ τὰ κρέα ἔσται σοι καθὰ καὶ τὸ στηθύνιον τοῦ ἐπιθέματος, καὶ κατὰ τὸν βραχίονα τὸν δεξιὸν σοι ἔσται. After we had adopted the above view as the result of our own investigation, we found that it had already been presented by Hengstenberg, *Authentie des Pentateuch*, Berlin 1839, B. ii. S. 406 f., but in such a way that it had been very properly rejected by Riehm, *Gesetzgebung Mosis*, S. 42. Riehm claims that since everything which opened the matrix belonged to the priests, therefore it was designed that they should receive the whole animal. It must be remembered, however, that after the general statements there are certain specifications, and that the grammar certainly allows, and harmony demands, that we should understand that the priests received the same proportion of the firstlings of sheep and cattle as of peace-offerings.

tion, however, fails to appreciate the connection, since the Deuteronomist considers—(1) the income of the tribe of Levi from the Lord; (*a*) that of the priests from His sacrifices, (*b*) that of the priests and Levites from His inheritance.¹ He then considers (2) the income of the priests from the people;² and (3) in the fourth verse changes an old law,³ by adding a regulation in regard to the fleece of the sheep. The third verse, instead of containing, as some think, a modification of the old law, is simply a new regulation, which is made for the benefit of the priests just as the Israelites are about to enter the promised land. Hence it in no way interferes with the portions which have been assigned to the priests from the offerings. It is nothing more or less than a direction to the Israelites, that when they slaughter for their own food they shall give the priest the shoulder, the two cheeks, and the maw. Keil remarks that it is questionable whether this gift is required from all the animals which were slaughtered for private use, or only from those which were killed for sacrificial meals. He decides in favour of the latter for two reasons: (1) because, as he affirms, the words *זבח זבח* are never employed in connection with ordinary slaughtering; (2) because the carrying out of this regulation would be attended with too much difficulty.⁴ As to the first objection, although these words are very generally used of sacrifices, this

¹ xviii. 1, 2.

² *Ibid.* v. 3.

³ Ex. xxii. 29a; Num. xviii. 12.

⁴ See his commentary *in loco*.

is not always the case. The verb is also used of ordinary slaughtering.¹

Keil's claim, that the noun זבַח is never used except of sacrifice, rests upon mooted passages, since he cannot quote in support of his statement with full assurance, Isa. xxxiv. 6, Jer. xlvi. 10, Ezek. xxxix. 17, where the Targum renders the noun זבַח by נְלִטָה, and indeed properly, since not an offering but a judicial slaughter is meant. As to the second objection, which has already been made by Riehm,² not only on account of the difficulty of meeting the regulation, but also because we have no confirmatory evidence that the priests were recipients of these gifts, it is not necessary to suppose that such a regulation would be obligatory on all without exception. We may rather suppose that it was designed only for those who lived conveniently near the priests. Further, there was no particular reason for stating the enforcement of the command, and no historical occasion for doing so.³ Indeed, to assert that a law can never have existed because historical writers make no mention of its application, especially if it is of minor importance, is pure assumption. Our explanation of Deut. xviii. 3 is strengthened by an ancient tradition. Josephus⁴

¹ Deut. xii. 15; 1 Sam. xxviii. 24; 1 Kings i. 9, xix. 21; 2 Chron. xviii. 2; Ezek. xxxiv. 3.

² *Gesetzgebung Mosis*, S. 41.

³ As, e.g., for the mention of the law concerning the sabbatical year.

⁴ *Antiquities*, iv. 4. 4: Εἶναι δὲ καὶ τοῖς κατ' αὐχού θύουσιν εὐαγχίας ἔνεκα τῆς αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ μὴ θρησκείας, ἀνάγκην κομίζειν τοῖς ιερεῦσιν ἔμμυστρον τε καὶ χελύνιον καὶ τὸν δεξιὸν βραχίονα τοῦ θύματος.

says: "Those also who were slaying at home for their banquets, but not for religious service, were obliged to bring to the priests the maw, the jaw, and the right shoulder of that which was slain." Philo¹ expresses himself in much the same terms: "But of those which are slain away from the altar for food, it is commanded that three things should be given to the priest—the shoulder, the jawbone, and the maw." This tradition appears in the Mishna, *Chullin* x. 1: "The shoulder, the two cheeks, and the maw are due, in the country and out of the country, at the time of the temple and when there is no temple, from the *Chullin*, *that which is common*, and not from the *Qodashim*, *that which is holy*." Otherwise one might ask, if the gifts are due from *Chullin*, from which the breast and shoulder are not due; are not the gifts due from the *Qodashim*, from which breast and shoulder are due? But the Scripture teaches: "I have given them to Aaron the priest and his sons by a statute for ever."² Therefore they only receive that which is mentioned in this place. Siphri and Pesikta rabbathi follow the Mishna in their interpretation of Deut. xviii. 3.

This unbroken tradition is certainly worthy of

¹ *De Præmiis sacerdotum et honoribus*, § 3, M. 235, says: Ἐπεὶ τῶν ἔξω τοῦ βαρυτοῦ θυσιαῖναι ἔνεκα κρεαταγίας τρία προστέταχται τῷ ιερεῖ δίδοσθαι, βραχίονα καὶ σταγόνα καὶ τὸ καλούμενον ἄνυπτρον.

² In this connection, the Midrash to Ps. i. 1, in an interesting tradition about Korah, the scorner, shows that the shoulder, the two cheeks, and the maw from the ordinary slaughtering are to be given to the priests. Korah relates, to the great amusement of the congregation, how Aaron drove a poor widow, through the rigorous enforcement of the priestly laws, to sell her field for two

attention. Our effort, however, is simply to prove that the contribution made to the priests is not from flesh slaughtered for sacrificial purposes, without trying to determine that which must baffle investigation, namely, when and how this contribution was made.

In the same connection with the above, it remains for us to consider vers. 6-8 : (1) with reference to their main object; (2) as to the question what is meant here by the term Levite; and (3) in order to see whether or not we can determine with certainty the service in which the Levites might voluntarily engage.

(1.) If we examine this passage as related to the preceding verses, in which provision has been made for the Levites, we shall see that the main object of vers. 6-8 is not to state, that if a Levite goes, with all the desire of his heart, to the place which the Lord shall choose, he may minister as his brethren do, but rather that a Levite thus coming and ministering is consequently to receive an equal portion with the rest of his brethren, *i.e.* the topic introduced in ver. 1 has not been changed.¹ The sixth and seventh verses form

sheep, which she killed for her own use, that she might be free from further exactions. To her astonishment, he demanded the shoulder, the two cheeks, and the maw. In a fit of desperation, she devoted them to the Lord, and was coolly informed by the triumphant Aaron, "that now they belong entirely to him." "Thus," says Korah, "you commit robbery with honour, and lay it all on God."

¹ We find that H. Homberg, the commentator to Mendelssohn's translation of *Deuteronomy*, says that the connection is as follows :

the first member of the proposition (protasis), the eighth verse the second member (apodosis).

(2.) It is claimed by Colenso,¹ Graf,² and Kayser,³ that according to these verses any Levite might become a priest. Colenso lays special emphasis on the phraseology, *standing before Jehorah*, which he says is used only of the priests. We have already proved in this dissertation that the expression is sometimes used of priests and Levites without discrimination.⁴ Colenso further claims that they must have been priests, because they have a right like the rest to eat their portion of the “sacrifice.” That the word “portion” is qualified by sacrifices is an unnecessary assumption, since not only priests but also Levites were employed in the tabernacle and temple service, Num. xviii. 1–5, 2 Chron. xxxi. 2, for whom provision was made, Num. xviii. 8, 31, 2 Chron. xxxi. 3, Neh. xii. 44. These passages show conclusively

“If the Levites shall come and minister as all his brethren the Levites, then they shall eat equal portions.” Herxheimer, *Der Pentateuch*, Leipzig 1865, S. 920, adopts the same construction: “Und wenn ein Levi kommt aus einem deiner Thore, aus ganz Jisrael, woselbst er sich aufhält, und geht nach aller Lust seiner Seele an den Ort, den der Ewige erwählen wird, und verrichtet den Dienst im Namen des Ewigen seines Gottes, wie alle seine Brüder, die Lewijim, die daselbst stehen vor dem Ewigen: so sollen sie zu gleichen Theilen geniessen; ausser dem, was er verkauft von den Vätern.” This construction seems to be plainly indicated, since וְשָׁרֶת in the seventh verse is in the same construction as וְבָנָה in the sixth.

¹ Colenso on the *Pentateuch*, Part iii. p. 515.

² *Geschichtl. Bücher* S. 43.

³ Kayser, *Das Vorexil. Buch.* S. 187.

⁴ See pp. 15-18, and compare 2 Chron. xxix. 4, 5, 11, 12.

that under the name "the Levite," both priest and Levite (Deut. xviii. 6a¹) may be included. Our text can simply be interpreted to mean, that a priest or Levite, who is moved by a heartfelt desire, on coming to Jerusalem, and entering on the service of the Lord, is entitled to the same provision as the rest of his brethren, whether Levitical priests or simply Levites.

(3.) The service which is meant in this passage remains undetermined. It is not so described that only priestly functions are included, while the Levitical are excluded. The Rabbins suppose that any one who belonged to the twenty-four divisions of the priesthood might come at will to offer a sacrifice for himself, provided he was not hindered by any physical disqualification. It is evident, however, that such a theory is without historical foundation, and we cannot determine from the verses before us what service was intended.

It has been affirmed, that while the middle books of the Pentateuch direct that the Levites shall receive forty-eight cities, Deuteronomy affords no trace of this, but rather represents the Levites generally as objects of charity. There is no special reason for our expecting any explicit mention of these cities in Deuteronomy. An indirect reference will serve our purpose quite as well as a definite command, like that which is found

¹ The Talmudical authorities understand this passage in relation to the priests: *Succa* 55b; *Baba Kama* 109b; *Menachoth* 74a. Ainsworth, Herxheimer, and Keil apply it to the priests and Levites without discrimination. And Sifri, which Rashi reproduces, holds that the sixth and seventh verses refer exclusively to the priests, but the reasons for this are insufficient.

in Num. xxxv. 2. The passages which we have been considering, according to our interpretation, show that the Levites as a tribe were in easy circumstances. A critical examination of xviii. 8b affords unexpected evidence as to their being holders of property. We admit that the construction of this clause is difficult, but there are certain data which seem to determine its meaning beyond the shadow of a doubt.

The Hebrew text is well translated in the English version, “Besides that which cometh of the sale of his patrimony :” it may be rendered more literally, “Besides his sales according to the fathers.”¹

The Samaritan version renders the passage : “Besides his sales of the fathers,” *i.e.* of the property which he has inherited from the fathers ; and the Septuagint : “Besides the sale according to his patrimony.” The word **מִמְכָר**, sale, occurs only ten times. If we suppose that the twenty-fifth chapter of Leviticus, where it is found seven times,² was already in existence, the interpretation of this clause ceases to be difficult, and we find a hint in Deuteronomy at the Levitical cities. In vers. 32–34 it is stated that the Levites may redeem their houses of the cities of their possession at any time, which implies, of

¹ The construction of this clause in the use of the prépositions is exceptionally difficult. **לְבַד**, signifying *besides*, is usually followed by **כִּי** ; there is, however, for this use a parallel in Ezra i. 6. The use of **לְ** is not easily determined ; the meaning is good when we understand his sales according to the value of the property—*e.g.* Isa. ix. 7, **רְצִין לְ** **לְ** **לְ**.

² Vers. 14, 25, 27, 28, 29, 50.

course, that they might sell them whenever they wished. They are not, however, allowed to sell the fields belonging to the cities.

Now, with these facts in view, the interpretation of Deut. xviii. 8b becomes much easier. The Deuteronomist evidently supposes the case of a Levite, who has sold his house in one of the Levitical cities, who may be residing among his brethren, or in one of the strictly Israelitic towns, and who is moved to engage in God's service. According to the Deuteronomist, he has a perfect right to go to the central sanctuary and draw a full support there; thus reserving the money which he has received for his house in case he should wish to redeem it.¹

It may be objected that we derive the impression from various passages in Deuteronomy that the Levites are poor:² (1) since they are classed with strangers, widows, and orphans as participating in the sacred meals; (2) because they are especially commended to the Israelites, as being without inheritance. We have so little historical data, that it is very difficult to determine the true circumstances of the tribe; but

¹ Aben Ezra, who is not bound by the tradition, says: "Some say that this is equivalent to **מבריהם** (receive no more money from your acquaintance, comp. v. 5); but this is too far-fetched, and is repugnant to the grammatical sense. **מבריר** comes from **מבר** as it is used Lev. xxv. 14. The meaning is, that if he sells his house which he has inherited from his fathers, then the house that was sold, and the city of his possession, shall go out in the year of jubilee; and this is the explanation of **על האבות** (according to the fathers): they shall not say to him, Behold, this is thine, thou shalt not eat anything else, but they shall eat like portions."

² xii. 18, 19; xiv. 27-29; xvi. 11, 14; xxvi. 12, 13.

it certainly appears from Deut. xviii. 1-8 that comfortable provision was made for them. Certainly, a little reflection should convince every one that participation in the sacrificial meals,¹ in the three stated feasts,² and the permission to come with all the needy of the land once in three years to share with them in the tithe of the products of the soil, could not be regarded as provision for a tribe. Such provisions can only be regarded as perquisites. They are similar to those privileges which are accorded to clergymen in some sections of America, such as a discount of twenty-five per cent. on books, cheaper fares on the railway, etc. It must be remembered, too, that when we give the Levites the benefit of all the provision which is assigned in the different books of the Pentateuch, we must still presuppose that many among them were poor, as in every other community.

Whether all Levites took part in the sacrificial meals with the Israelites, we cannot now determine. Those who were in better circumstances, doubtless provided for themselves.³ It certainly does not follow from the exhortations given not to neglect the Levite, that all the members of the tribe were dependent upon this provision. The fact that they are classed with the *גְּרִים*, *strangers*, does not prove that they all without exception were poor, since we know that some of these strangers were wealthy.⁴

It is further claimed that the Deuteronomic expression,

¹ xii. 18.

² xvi. 2, 10, 11, 13, 14.

³ 1 Sam. i. 3-9.

⁴ Lev. xxv. 47; Deut. xxviii. 43, 44.

“from thy gates,” indicates that the Levites had no cities of their own. This conclusion, however, is not correct. We have seen that the Levites could sell their houses, perhaps even their cities, to Israelites.¹ This would naturally lead to their being scattered among the other tribes, who would thus obtain at least partial possession of their cities. Hence it is quite possible that there was not a single city of the Levites which did not contain a strong infusion of those who were not Levites.

Many of the Levites might be scattered among the people as collectors of tithes, as teachers, etc., which would lead a not inconsiderable portion of their number to reside in almost every community of the Israelites.

The lot of the Levites would naturally be subject to many changes, as we see from their experience in the time of Jeroboam, when many of them were deprived of their houses.² Taking all these things into account, the exhortation not to neglect the Levite who is in thy gates, from the great Lawgiver, who saw the future with a prophetic eye, is particularly appropriate. It does not prove, however, that the Levites did not possess any gates (cities) of their own.

In our opinion, the greatest difficulties in this discussion seem to centre around Deut. xiv. 27-29, taken in connection with xxvi. 12, 14. They are twofold :

(1.) The Levites, with others, are said to eat all the tithe within the gates.

¹ Lev. xxv. 32, 33; comp. Jer. xxxii. 6-12.

² 2 Chron. xi. 14.

(2.) The third year is called the year of tithing.

These statements seem to be in direct contradiction to the laws in Num. xviii. But, before allowing that we have a contradiction here, we must consider certain things. The Bible must be subjected to the same process for history as for doctrine. Scattered facts must be collected, compared, and reconciled. This is necessary on account of the disconnected style of ancient composition, to which the Scriptures furnish no exception. Sharpness and detail are especially wanting in Deuteronomy. With these cautions in mind, let us consider the various explanations which have been attempted of these passages, especially of xxvi. 12, 14, which furnishes the greatest difficulty.

(1.) The solution suggested by the Septuagint would be a very happy one if it were sustained by the Hebrew text:¹ “But when thou hast finished the titling of all thy tithe of thine increase in the third year, the second tithe thou shalt give to the Levite, the proselyte, the orphan, and the widow, and they shall eat in thy cities and rejoice.” A glance, however, at the present Hebrew text shows that this is highly improbable. Moreover, the Targum of Onkelos, the second Jerusalem Targum, and the Samaritan text, which in this case essentially agree with the Hebrew, are against it. The Greek

¹ Ἐὰν δὲ συντελέσῃς ἀποδέκατῶσαι πᾶν τὸ ἐπιδέκατον τῶν γεννημάτων σου ἐν τῷ ἔτει τῷ τρίτῳ, τὸ δεύτερον ἐπιδέκατον [שנת המיעשך הינו]=
δὸσεις τῷ Λευίτῃ καὶ τῷ προστλύτῳ καὶ τῷ ὄρφανῷ καὶ τῇ κήρῳ, καὶ φάγουται ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι σου καὶ εὐφρανθήσονται.

translation can only have arisen from an effort to conform the text to the Jewish tradition.¹

(2.) The paraphrases of the Jerusalem Targums were formed after the same tradition. The first Jerusalem Targum renders the passage: "When thou shalt finish tithing all the tithe of thy produce in the third year of release, and shalt give the first tithe to the Levite; the second tithe, which is the tithe of the poor, to the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, that they may eat in thy cities and be satisfied; and thou shalt bring the third tithe and eat it before the Lord thy God, etc."²

We admit, however, that the verses which we are considering³ give no intimation of the first tithe. But the question is, whether they really exclude it. We answer as follows:—

(1.) The tithe here mentioned is characterized as all the tithe of the produce, or, ver. 13, "the hallowed things."³ As this does not include the tithe of the cattle,⁴ which fell exclusively to the priests and Levites, so it does not exclude that proportion of the first tithe which consisted of the fruits of the ground. No indication is given of the amount which each of the classes receives. As regards the distribution of the tithe in the third year,

¹ *Pesikta Surtata*: "Wherever thou findest a Levite, give him from his portion; if not from his portion, give him the second tithe; if not of the second tithe, give him from the peace-offering." By his portion the first tithe is intended.

² Deut. xiv. 27-29, xxvi. 12, 13.

³ Comp. Lev. xxvii. 30; Num. xviii. 21; 2 Chron. xxxi. 6.

⁴ Notice the same expression in the last reference given, which considers the tithe as twofold: (1) as consisting of oxen and sheep; and (2) of holy things.

the Levites, as the most prominent recipients, are placed first. There is nothing to prove that they did not carry away their usual proportion for themselves and the priests. It may be said that they are represented as eating it on the spot. This is not the case. There is nothing in the passage which warrants the assumption that the owner instituted a grand feast on his premises. It is not said that they ate it at once. The thirteenth verse indicates that they did not eat in the house of the owner, since he is said to have brought the things out of his house. The expression, "all the tithe,"¹ can include that portion of the first tithe which consisted of the products of the soil. Since the second tithe did not extend to both flocks and herds, it was thrown together with the vegetable portion of the first tithe once in three years. Of this the Levites received their usual share, leaving the entire second tithe for the poor, since there does not seem to be any sufficient evidence that it was consumed at Jerusalem, except during four years out of the seven.

(2.) This theory serves to explain the expression "year of tithing," which certainly could not thus be named if only the tithe for the poor were raised, since the same amount, which is called a tithe, was consumed at Jerusalem. But if in this year, in addition to the first tithe, the second tithe was added for the poor, of which the owner might not partake, then we have a reason why the third year could be emphatically called the year of tithing.

¹ Deut. xiv. 28.

CHAPTER IV.

THE BLESSING OF LEVI.

Summary: May every member of the tribe exercise the functions named?—Priests represent the tribe—The speaker presupposes his hearers' acquaintance with Urim and Thummim—Meaning of the word *Kohēn* (priest)—According to Deuteronomy, Eleazar succeeds his father in the priesthood—It is Aaron's office to bear the Urim and Thummim—Peculiarly sacred character of the high priest—Functions of the priesthood: teaching, judging, burning of incense (Korah), putting sacrifices on the altar—Summing up.

WE now come to the blessing of Levi, Deut. xxxiii. 8–11. It is necessary that we should inquire here, as in the preceding passages (Deut. x. 9, xviii. 1–8) which we have considered, whether every son of Levi, by virtue of his belonging to the tribe, might exercise the functions named, or whether anything prevents our assuming that the tribe is addressed as a whole, although composed of a high priest, priests, and Levites. Graf¹ and Kuenen² refer all these functions to the entire tribe, without distinction. All are gifted with Thummim and Urim, all may be teachers, may put incense before the Lord, and whole burnt sacrifice upon His altar. Of course, if this can be

¹ *Der Segen Mose's*, Leipzig 1857, S. 31–58.

² *The Religion of Israel*, vol. i. p. 99 ff.

proved, we have a contradiction in all of these particulars between Deuteronomy and the middle books of the Pentateuch. If not, the functions of the tribe of Levi are mentioned without discrimination of the higher and lower offices. Indeed, the passage is best understood if it is applied to those who stand for the tribe, the priests, and whose prerogatives are an honour for the whole tribe. Hence the benediction says that the Thummim and Urim shall be with one individual; then, after a general reference to the faithfulness of the tribe as a whole, specific mention is made of the priestly functions.

We have, then, the first part of the blessing: "And to Levi He saith, Thy Thummim and thy Urim be with the man, thy holy one, whom thou didst try in Massah, and with whom thou didst contend at the waters of Meribah, who said to his father and to his mother, I have not seen him; who did not regard his brethren, nor recognise his children."¹

It is evident that the speaker presupposes that his hearers are acquainted with the meaning of Urim and Thummim, and the historical circumstances to which he refers. Our most natural course will be to examine related passages in the middle books of the Pentateuch. But before doing this, we must consider the interpretation given to this passage by some of the latest critics. Kuenen² says: "The poet—presumably a contemporary of Jeroboam II. (800 B.C.)—there says to Jahveh:

¹ Deut. xxxiii. 8, 9.

² *The Religion of Israel*, vol. i. p. 99.

‘Thy Thummim and thy Urim are for the man, thy favoured one, whom thou hast proved at Massah, with whom thou hast striven by the waters of Meribah.’ Vers. 9–11 prove convincingly that this refers to the Levites in general. Therefore the poet, as well as the writer of 1 Sam. ii. 28, attributes the prerogative of using the Urim and the Thummim, and thus also of wearing the ephod, *to the priest*—not to one single priest.

“If we put all this together, it is clear that it was the priestly legislation which, in accordance—as we shall see hereafter—with its whole tendency, but at variance with history, assigned the ephod and the oracle connected with it to the high priest. Before the exile they both belonged to the priests in general. In fact, as Land has correctly observed,¹ ‘giving oracles

¹ In the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, Leiden 1868, z. 171: “As concerns the offerings which are everywhere brought by the people themselves (Ex. xxiv. 5–8; 1 Sam. ii. 13–16, vi. 14, 15), although the Kôhen, *priest*, as acquainted with the proper ceremonies, often has a rôle to play in them, yet his proper business consists in questioning and giving an answer from the oracle (Judg. xx. 28; 1 Sam. xiv. 34, 37, xxii. 10). The title כָּהֵן, anciently *Kâhin*, had originally among the Semites probably the general signification of somebody who reported the hidden things of God to the people; as among the Arabs, before Mohammed, it indicated just the same as the Hebrew נָבִי.” Land refers to Sprenger, *Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammed*, Berl. 1861, B. i. S. 255, who says: “As a series of emperors who called themselves Imperatores followed a fortunate Imperator, so a seer could found an order of priests which retained the title Kâhin, but the reverse is improbable. I believe, therefore, that the Kâhine in the Arabic sense are older than the Kôhene in Hebrew.”

is the priest's proper task; the very name which he bears (*kôhen*) points to this.'"

This theory of Kuenen's is not supported by facts. (1.) The original meaning of the word, if we allow that it is contained in the Arabic, is to stand by a person in order to help him.¹ (2.) The use of the word priest, which occurs twelve times in Deuteronomy, does not represent the giving of oracles as his proper task. It has been claimed that the Deuteronomist ignores the high priest.² This designation occurs only three times in the Pentateuch, besides which he is four times named the anointed priest. Instead of the official name, high priest, in Exodus—Numbers, either Aaron is immediately named, or the functions which are peculiar to him. If we apply this test to Deuteronomy, we have two allusions to the high priest. (1.) In Deut. x. 6 Eleazar is named as succeeding his father Aaron in the priesthood. Since Aaron and Eleazar

¹ See Fleischer in Delitzsch's *Biblischer Commentar über den Propheten Jesaia*, Leipzig 1869, S. 691, and the author's remark. Compare Edersheim, *The Temple*, London 1874, p. 61: "This root-meaning (through the Arabic) of the Hebrew word for priest, as one intervening, explains its occasional, though very rare, application to others than priests, as, for example, to the sons of David (2 Sam. viii. 18), a mode of expression which is thus correctly paraphrased in 1 Chron. xviii. 17: 'And the sons of David were at the hand of the king.'"

² Graf, *Die Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 43, says: "Aaron is only mentioned as saved from the execution of the divine wrath through the intercession of Moses." Such an allusion to Aaron would be very obscure if we could not refer to Exodus—Numbers. The very fact that Moses prays for Aaron, singling him out of all Israel, indicates a pre-eminence.

are the only persons named as occupying the priesthood, it indicates that their office is superior to that of the Levitical priests. If it had been specifically mentioned that the high priest was meant, it might have been of service to us, but it would have been superfluous for the persons addressed, who knew what Aaron's office was. (2.) According to Ex. xxviii. 30, Lev. viii. 8, Aaron is to bear the Urim and Thummim upon his heart. Deut. xxxiii. 8 does not contradict this, but rather seems to allude to it. [The first wish in the benediction is, that the Urim and Thummim may be with a certain individual¹ of the tribe, with thy (God's) holy one. There is nothing to prevent our understanding this of Aaron, who is called the "saint of the Lord," Ps. cvi. 16 (comp. Num. xvi. 3-5, Lev. xxi. 6, of the ordinary priests), although Aaron, at the time when the benediction was spoken, was already dead, yet Moses considered him the representative of the high-priesthood for all time. The reference here is not to some ideal person² in the tribe of Levi; but as the waters of Meribah indicate a real

¹ The first and second Jerusalem Targums, Vatablus, John-Buxtorf (*Historia Urim et Thummim*), Ugolini (*Thesaurus, Venetiis* 1751, tom. xii. p. 378), Spencer (*De Urim et Thummim, Ibid.* p. 673), and others, refer this to Aaron.

² Volck, *Der Segen Mosis*, Erlangen 1873, S. 72, says: "Es stellt sich alles zurecht, wenn man לְאִישׁ חֲסִידָךְ ideal und individualisirend von demjenigen versteht, welcher in Levi's Stammie נְאִישׁ חֲסִידָךְ ist." Certainly Aaron, judged by the standard of his time, is worthy of this designation. We need not seek for perfection in him any more than in David, who was styled a man after God's own heart in spite of his great sin. Comp. 1 Kings xv. 5.

place, so we have here to do with a real person, who, by reason of his office and character, in spite of his failure in this extraordinary trial, was worthy of the designation **רְبִנָה**. It may be objected that God was the one who was tried, and with whom the people strove. While this is true, it does not exclude the idea of their contending with His servants, or of God's proving Aaron by means of Israel.¹ We have every reason to suppose that he came out of the temptation of Massah² unsullied. That he fell with Moses at Meribah³ furnishes no ground why he and his descendants in the high priest's office should not be the bearers of Urim and Thummim. (3.) The peculiarly sacred character of the high priest, and his deadness to the ordinary relations of life, are indicated in the words, "Who said unto his father and to his mother, I have not seen him; neither did he acknowledge his brethren, nor knew his own children." While this may refer to Ex. xxxii. 27, it also refers to Lev. xxi. 11, 12, where we learn that the last tender duties of affection were denied to the high priest from fear of defilement; and to Lev. x. 6, where Aaron, Eleazar, and Ithamar were not allowed to mourn for their sons and brothers.

It has been claimed, however, that Deut. xxxiii. 9b, 10 shows conclusively that these words apply to the whole

¹ Comp. Ps. lxxxii. 8, where God is said to have proved the people at the waters of Meribah.

² Ex. xvii. 2-7. This passage, however, gives no information.

³ Num. xx. 12, 13.

tribe, since the verbs in the last part of the ninth verse, which seem to be in close connection with the preceding part, are in the plural.¹ But this close connection is merely apparent. We have a perfect right to make a full pause after the words, “nor knew his own children,” as in the Hebraic Samaritan of the Polyglot. We then translate the rest of the passage as follows: “Because they have observed thy word and kept thy covenant, they shall teach Jacob thy judgments, and Israel thy law; they shall put incense before thee, and whole burnt sacrifice upon thine altar.” This construction, in which the causal sentence precedes, is perfectly allowable.² Only those who have observed the word of the Lord, and kept His covenant, are fitted to be teachers of that word and covenant.

The functions mentioned in the foregoing passage are, according to the middle books of the Pentateuch, priestly.

(1.) The priests are the repositories and natural guardians of the law. Hence they are the teachers of the people: “And that ye (Aaron and his sons)

¹ Graf, *Der Segen Mose's*, S. 31, says: “Man hat unter diesem אֶת חֲסִידָה den Hohepriester allein verstehen wollen, allein was in den folgenden Versen davon ausgesagt wird, bezieht sich auf den ganzen Stamm Levi, und da dieser Singular ein Collectivbegriff ist, so geht auch das Verbum am Ende des folgenden Verses und V. 10 in den Plural über.”

² Compare Gen. iii. 14, 17, “Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle. . . . And unto Adam He said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it, cursed is the ground for thy sake;” xviii. 20; Hos. iv. 1-3.

may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses.”¹ Other passages in Deuteronomy represent the priests as teachers: “And thou shalt come unto the priests the Levites, and unto the judge that shall be in those days, and inquire, and they shall show thee the sentence of judgment . . . according to the sentence of the law which they shall teach thee, and according to the judgment which they shall tell thee.² Take heed in the plague of leprosy that thou observe diligently, and do according to all that the priests the Levites shall teach you.”³ The following is a significant fact, which those who hold that the Chronicler has closely followed the middle books of the Pentateuch may well ponder. How does it happen, that while the Pentateuch, 2 Kings,⁴ Jeremiah,⁵ Ezekiel,⁶ Micah,⁷ Haggai,⁸ Malachi,⁹ represent the priests as the fountains of law and the teachers of the people, the Chronicler and Nehemiah speak of the Levites as giving instruction to the people?¹⁰

(2.) Although the priests are not specifically mentioned in the benediction as judging the people, yet the judicial function is so closely connected with that

¹ Lev. x. 11.

² Deut. xvii. 9, 11a.

³ *Ibid.* xxiv. 8.

⁴ xii. 3 (E. V. ver. 2), xvii. 27.

⁵ xviii. 18.

⁶ xliv. 23.

⁷ iii. 11.

⁸ ii. 11-13.

⁹ ii. 7.

¹⁰ Under Jehoshaphat, the commission which was chosen by him for the instruction of the people consisted of princes, Levites and priests, but pre-eminently of Levites (2 Chron. xvii. 7-9), and the Levites bore (2 Chron. xxxv. 3; Neh. viii. 9) the designation of teachers of the people.

of teaching, that this is the proper place to consider the subject. In Deut. xvii. 9, xxi. 5, judicial authority is clearly assigned to the priests. While they are not spoken of in the middle books of the Pentateuch as judges, there is nothing to prevent our assuming that they exercised this function after the death of Moses. During his lifetime, while judges were chosen from the people to hear the common cases, the more difficult ones were brought to Moses.¹ After his death, such cases were undoubtedly referred to Joshua and the high priest at Shiloh.² Certainly, there is no essential contradiction between the middle books of the Pentateuch and Deuteronomy, since in any case the legal knowledge of the priests (Lev. x. 11) fitted them to act as judges.

(3.) "They shall put incense before thee," Num. xvii. 5 (E. V. xvi. 40), very clearly teaches that only the descendants of Aaron may burn incense before the Lord. It is claimed that the Deuteronomist had never read anything about Korah, because in xi. 6 he only mentions Dathan and Abiram.³ It seems strange that such a handle should have been made of this omission. (a) A glance at the context shows that the speaker is reminding the children of Israel, in the briefest manner, of God's mighty power, as manifested on Pharaoh and in His dealings with them. If he had been addressing the Levites only, or assigning the reason for this judgment, we might expect that Korah's name would have

¹ Ex. xviii. 25, 26.

² Josh. xviii. 1, 10, xix. 51, xxi. 1.

³ Kayser, *Das Vorexil. Buch.* S. 13; comp. Colenso on the *Pentateuch*, London 1863, Part iii. p. 459.

been added, as in Sirach.¹ (b) The mention of Dathan and Abiram does not exclude Korah. This appears from the different designations which are given to the rebels in Num. xvi., where, in the first verse, they are called Korah, Dathan, Abiram, and On ; or more briefly, vers. 5, 16, and xvii. 5 (E. V. xvi. 40), Korah and his company ; or vers. 24, 27, Korah, Dathan, and Abiram ; or ver. 25, simply Dathan and Abiram ; comp. 12, as equivalent to the foregoing. In Psalm cxi. these rebels are mentioned as Dathan and Abiram, perhaps less to spare the feelings of the celebrated family of temple singers who bear the same name as Korah,² than to conform to the usage which had characterized the rebellion, for the sake of brevity, as that of Dathan and Abiram.

It has been assumed, on account of this supposed ignorance of the Deuteronomist of Num. xvi., taken in connection with Deut. xxxiii. 10, that all the Levites without exception might enjoy the privilege of offering sacrifice. Since, however, the tribe of Levi includes the priests, it cannot be proved that any but priests could burn incense. Nor do we think that any candid reasoner, who weighs the arguments which we have adduced, can claim that Deut. xi. 6 implies an ignorance of Korah's participation in the rebellion. If 2 Chron. xiii. 10, 11 contained the only reference of

¹ xlvi. 18: Ἐπισυνέστησαν αὐτῷ ἀλλότριοι, καὶ ἐζήλωσαν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἑρήμῳ, ἀνδρες οἱ περὶ Δαθὰν καὶ Ἀβιράν, καὶ ἡ συναγωγὴ Κοος ἐν θυμῷ καὶ ὀργῇ.

² Geiger's *Urschrift*, Breslau 1857, S. 82.

the Chronicler to the burning of incense, one might claim, with a better show of reason, that the Levites in his time as well as the priests were allowed to burn incense. Of course, so long as we hold that xxvi. 18 is from the same author, there is no room for such a supposition. But who knows whether the time may not come, when a hyper-criticism will find as striking contradictions between different portions of the Chronicles as many critics now discover between Deuteronomy and the books which precede it?

(4.) *Putting sacrifices on the altar.*

This, according to the middle books of the Pentateuch, after the installation of Aaron and his sons, is only allowed to them. Before they were thus set apart, Moses appointed young men from the children of Israel, who offered burnt-offerings and sacrificed peace-offerings before the Lord;¹ but whether they put these sacrifices upon the altar, or whether that was done by Moses, who consecrated the altar and the people with the blood (ver. 6), is uncertain, since the terms above used are ambiguous, as appears from 1 Chron. xxiii. 31, where it is said that the office of the Levites is to offer all burnt-sacrifices to the Lord.² At the installation of Aaron and his sons, Moses acted the part of a priest.³

¹ Ex. xxiv. 5.

² וְלֹכֶל הַעֲלִיתָ עֹלֹת לֵיהּוּה. No one familiar with Chronicles will claim from this that all Levites are admitted to priestly functions. It is probable that in the times of the Chronicler, on the occasions mentioned in this passage, the Levites simply brought the sacrifices to the priests.

³ Ex. xxix. 10-28; Lev. viii. 14-29; comp. Ps. xcix. 6.

There is no indication, however, in the middle books of the Pentateuch, that Moses exercised the priest's office after his brother had been inducted into it. Although the priests are mentioned several times in Deuteronomy, this is the only place where they are spoken of as putting sacrifices on the altar. This naturally follows from the nature of these passages, which are not merely a superfluous repetition from regulations in the middle books of the Pentateuch in regard to sacrifices, but rather a statement of the people's relation to the priests, as guardians and teachers of the law, and in their judicial capacity.

We have thus reached the end of our examination of the passages in Deuteronomy with regard to the Levitical priests, with this result: (1.) These references are so incomplete as to demand the existence of as full a code as is contained in the middle books of the Pentateuch. (2.) There is no radical contradiction between the brief notices of the Levitical priests and the more complete regulations concerning them in the preceding books. (3.) Apparent contradictions are due to the oratorical, prophetic, and popular character of Deuteronomy, as distinguished from the more minute and strictly legal statements of the middle books of the Pentateuch. Deuteronomy is emphatically the people's book;¹ Exodus—Numbers, the code of the priests. The popular form in Deuteronomy is later than the technical so-called priestly legislation, and

¹ This was written before we had seen the work entitled *Deuteronomy the People's Book.*

naturally follows it. Since, however, the hypothesis, that the Deuteronomic is older than the so-called priestly legislation (in Exodus—Numbers), is asserted on other grounds than the apparent contradiction between them, we must carefully examine these before we can venture a critical opinion as to the authorship of Deuteronomy. Certain passages from the Book of Ezekiel are made the key-stone of this theory. It is claimed, that while Ezekiel follows Deuteronomy, it precedes the middle books of the Pentateuch. An examination of this theory will next engage us.

CHAPTER V.

THE MODERN CRITIC'S BRIDGE.

Summary: "Ezekiel the bridge between Deuteronomy and the Middle Books of the Pentateuch"—"Levites degraded priests"—"Distinction between the priests and Levites"—"Ezekiel the author of Lev. xvii.-xxvi."—The frequent recurrence of the same expressions in Leviticus and Ezekiel do not prove that they are from the same author—Comparison between Jeremiah and Leviticus—Reasons for the similarity between Leviticus and Ezekiel—Style of Ezekiel radically different from that of Leviticus—Two branches in the house of Aaron—Line of Ithamar cursed in Eli—Henceforth they occupy an inferior position—Who are the Levites mentioned in Ezekiel?—Exorbitant tests—Why does Ezekiel deviate so much from the priestly laws?—Character and influence of Ezekiel's prophecy.

THE relation of Ezekiel to Deuteronomy and the middle books of the Pentateuch is of the greatest importance for our discussion, since several modern critics claim that he (572¹ B.C.) forms the bridge between the Deuteronomic (625² B.C.) and the Elohistic codification of the priestly laws (538–458 B.C.³). Graf, Kuenen, and Kayser trace a gradual development in the regulations as to the priests. They claim, as has already been stated, that according to the

¹ Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 153, assigns this date for the composition of Ezekiel.

² *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 242.

³ *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 152.

Deuteronomist any Levite may become priest; that under Ezekiel part of the Levites were degraded from the priesthood, which was still retained by their brethren the sons of Zadok;¹ and that the distinction between priests, as sons of Aaron, and the Levites arose in the time of Ezra.² All these critics agree that before Ezekiel, Leviticus xviii.-xxvi. (according to Kayser, xvii.-xxvi.) was not in existence. Graf and Kayser attribute this portion of Leviticus directly to him;³ Kuenen to a priest who worked in his spirit.⁴ All claim that these chapters were afterwards woven into the Pentateuch by the Elohist, who most probably was Ezra himself.⁵ It will be seen that this hypothesis in regard to the Book of Ezekiel is the key-stone in this theory of the development of the Levitical to the Aaronitic priests. The claim that Ezekiel is author of the chapters xvii.-xxvi. in ^{under} ~~Ezekiel~~ rests upon the frequency with which certain expressions⁶

¹ Graf, *Die Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 45.

² *Ibid.* S. 46. Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, vol. i. p. 337; comp. vol. ii. pp. 231, 232; Kayser, *Das Vorexil. Buch.* S. 188, 196.

³ Graf, S. 81; Kayser, S. 177.

⁴ Kuenen, vol. ii. p. 191.

⁵ Graf, S. 71, and in *Merx' Archiv*, S. 476; Kuenen, vol. ii. p. 233; Duhm, *Die Theologie der Propheten*, Bonn 1875, S. 269.

⁶ For a full list of these, see Graf, *Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 81, 82, and Kayser, *Das Vorexilische Buch.* S. 177-179; and for a refutation of the Ezekielian authorship of Lev. xviii.-xxvi., Klostermann in Delitzsch's *Zeitschrift für die Lutherische Theologie*, Leipz. 1877, Heft iii. S. 401-445. Those who are unacquainted with Hebrew can get a general view of the subject from the careful use of a good English reference Bible. It will be seen that Ezekiel, while drawing more expressions from Lev. xxvi. than from any other source, betrays a familiarity with phrases which are scattered

in these chapters are found in his writings. As the result of our independent investigation, we have arrived at the following conclusions:—

through the entire Pentateuch. Comp. Gen. vi. 9 and Ezek. xiv. 14, 20, the only passages in the O. T. where Noah is called just (צְדִיק); Gen. vi. 11, 13, "The earth is filled with violence," with Ezek. viii. 17, "They have filled the land with violence," an expression which does not occur elsewhere except in these places in the O. T.; Gen. xl ix. 27, "Benjamin shall ravin as a wolf," with Ezek. xxii. 27, "Her princes . . . are like wolves ravening the prey," a simile which does not occur elsewhere; Ex. vi. 8 and Num. xiv. 30, with Ezek. xlvi. 14, "Concerning which I lifted up my hand;" comp. Ezek. xx. 6, 15, 23, 28, 42, xxxvi. 7, xliv. 12. These are the only passages where this phraseology occurs. Ex. vii. 5, xiv. 4, 18, "And the Egyptians shall know that I am the Lord," with Ezek. xxx. 19. The similarity between Ex. xxiv. 10 and Ezek. i. 26, x. 1, is very striking. The style in Exodus is simpler and more grand. Comp. further Ex. xxxi. 13, "Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you," with Ezek. xx. 12, 20, "Moreover, also, I gave them my Sabbaths to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." The passage in Ezekiel cannot refer to any existing verse in the O. T. except this. Without pursuing these single comparisons farther, let us consider: I. *Some allusions in Ezekiel to observances of which no hint is given in the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xx. 22-26, xxi.-xxiii., Kuenen), Deuteronomy, or Lev. xi.-xv. and xvii.-xxvi.* (1.) The ceremonies to be employed in the consecration of the altar, as given by Ezek. xliii. 18-27, are partially found in the portions which are not excepted of Ex.-Lev. (a) Seven days were employed in its purification, comp. ver. 26 with Ex. xxix. 37. (b) The blood of a bullock was to be put on the four horns of the altar, ver. 20, Ex. xxix. 12; comp. Lev. viii. 15, where it is definitely stated that Moses used this ceremony to sanctify the altar. Although there are some slight deviations, the ceremonial as given in Ex.-Lev. is evidently older than in Ezekiel. (c) The bullock is to be burned in the appointed place outside the sanctuary, ver. 21, Ex. xxix. 14. These three

(1.) The frequent recurrence of many expressions which are found in Leviticus in Ezekiel does not prove that he was the author of xvii.-xxvi., or that

points in Ezekiel seem to have been derived from the law of Moses. In Exodus, the consecration of the altar is mentioned incidentally as preparatory to the consecration of Aaron and his sons to the priest's office ; in Ezekiel, the consecration of the new altar is more particularly described, but nothing is said of the consecration of the priests who, centuries before, had been inducted into office.

(2.) The scattering of salt upon the offerings, Ezek. xliii. 24, presupposes Lev. ii. 13. II. *Ordinances with reference to the priests in Ezek. xliv. 17-31, which for the most part are found in the portions which are not excepted.* (1.) They are to be clothed in linen, vers. 17-19 : consisting (a) of linen bonnets, ver. 18, comp. Ex. xxxix. 28 ; and (b) of linen breeches. (2.) They are not to drink wine when they enter into the inner court, ver. 21, comp. Lev. x. 9.

(3.) They are to teach the people to distinguish between the holy and the profane, etc., ver. 23, comp. Lev. x. 11. (4.) The laws for cleansing, vers. 26, 27, comp. Num. vi. 10, xix. 11. It will be seen that no specific laws are given for the cleansing of the priests in Numbers, but they are implied in the regulations which are assigned for the ordinary Israelites and the Nazarites. With reference to the sin-offering, comp. Lev. iv. 3, where it is specifically described. (5.) Income of the priests, vers. 29, 30. (a) The meat-offering, Lev. ii. 3, x. 12, 13. (b) The sin-offering, Lev. vi. 25, 26. (c) The trespass-offering, Lev. vii. 1-6, comp. with the three preceding, Num. xviii. 9. (d) Every dedicated thing, Num. xviii. 14. (e) Every oblation, Ex. xxxvi. 3. (f) The first of the dough, comp. Num. xv. 20. Three conclusions follow from the unprejudiced examination of these passages with scientific certainty: (1.) There are not only striking correspondences between Ezekiel and Lev. xi.-xv., xvii.-xxvi., but also between him and the other portions of the Pentateuch. (2.) At least so much of it as is contained in these passages existed before the time of Ezekiel.

(3.) Kuenen's assertion (*The Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 115), that only the Book of the Covenant and Deuteronomy are presupposed by Ezekiel, is false.

On account of a similar although less frequent correspondence between expressions in Leviticus xi.-xv. and Ezekiel, Kayser,

a subsequent writer borrowed them from him. It is often the case that a writer is insensibly moulded by some author, so that, without intending it, he borrows the style, and even the modes of expression, of his favourite author. This avails with much greater force of the Old Testament writers, who do not affect originality like modern authors, and who, by their union with the preceding writers, testify to the continuity of the divine revelation; but the relation of one prophet to another is not the same as to the Mosaic law, which is the basis of their prophecies, and the subject of their practical application. It may be objected, however, that while this would furnish a reason why Ezekiel's writings should receive a colouring from the entire Pentateuch, it does not avail as an explanation for the strong infusion of the same or similar expressions in Lev. xvii.-xxvi. and Ezekiel.

But (2) Ezekiel is not the only one who shows the influence of Leviticus. The same similarity, although on a smaller scale, exists between this portion of Leviticus and Jeremiah,¹ who seems to

Das Vorexilische Buch. S. 180 f., suggests that he might also have been the author of these chapters, which may have been modified by a subsequent hand. Graf, S. 75, holds that i.-xvi. and xviii.-xxvi. are from two different authors.

¹ Comp. Jer. vii. 23, "I will be your God, and ye shall be my people," with the same expression in Lev. xxvi. 12, Jer. xi. 4, xxx. 22, and Ezek. xi. 20, xxxvi. 28, in a different order. Jer. ii. 20, "For of old time I have broken thy yoke, and burst thy bands," with Lev. xxvi. 13, "And I have broken the band of thy yoke, and made you go upright;" Ezek. xxxiv. 27, "And they shall know that I am the

have been familiar with its contents, as well as with that of Deuteronomy.

The pregnant twenty-sixth chapter of Leviticus, which so clearly foreshadows the destiny of Israel in their apostasy, would naturally be specially impressed upon the prophet's mind.¹ It must be admitted, however, that Ezekiel shows pre-eminently the influence of this book. For this there are sufficient reasons.

(3.) Ezekiel was a priest. Hence we should expect to find in his writings many expressions from the Thorah, especially from the priestly portions, which, as a teacher and fountain of the law, he must have known by heart.² These expressions, without any effort on his part, were woven into the warp and woof of his

Lord, when I have broken the bands of their yoke." Jer. ix. 25 (E. V. 26), "All the house of Israel are uncircumcised in the heart," with Lev. xxvi. 41, "If then their uncircumcised hearts be humbled;" Ezek. xliv. 7, "Strangers uncircumcised in heart."

¹ There can be no doubt that Isa. i. 7 is an echo of Lev. xxvi. (Deut. xxviii.). See Delitzsch, *Biblischer Commentar über den Propheten Jesaia*, Leipzig 1869, S. 40.

² Exactly the arguments which Graf, *Die Geschichtlichen Bücher*, S. 83, adduces in support of his theory that Ezekiel was the author of Lev. xviii.-xxvi., seem to have been prepared for our benefit. Graf shows that Ezekiel, as we should expect from his office, was the instructor of his people, Ezek. viii. 1, xiv. 1, xx. 1; comp. xxxiii. 30 ff. The supposition, however, that he has written, besides his prophecy and the sacerdotal regulations connected with it, those priestly laws which are contained in Lev. xviii.-xxvi., is very improbable. The fact that so many expressions occur in his prophecy which correspond with those in the twenty-sixth chapter of Leviticus, which contains more than a quarter of the references which are found in the entire book of Leviticus, shows how his mind dwelt upon that priestly prophecy with which he could give point to so many lessons.

discourse. How can any one who has seriously considered the matter, claim that a prophet should represent himself as the mouth of the Lord to the people in one class of writings, adapting himself to the circumstances of the people, and that in another he should represent the Lord as speaking to Moses hundreds of years before? If such a supposition does not condemn itself, it is condemned in Ezekiel's style, which is not that of Leviticus. While the twenty-sixth chapter of Leviticus is condensed and pithy, simple and straightforward, Ezekiel is often diffuse, obscure, and labyrinthian. While Leviticus is written in pure Hebrew, Ezekiel is tainted with Chaldaic (Babylonian) expressions and irregular forms.¹ The only reasonable conclusion which we can draw from this and the preceding points is, that while Ezekiel could not have been the author of Lev. xvii.—xxvi., his book has unwittingly derived many expressions from it.

Some of the modern critics make a purely gratuitous assumption, when they claim that Ezek. xliv. 10—15 plainly indicates that the Levites which appear in the middle books of the Pentateuch have arisen from the degradation of some of the priests, who were originally merely Levites. The following seems to us to be the only reasonable explanation of the passage:—

(1.) We here have to do with the original descend-

¹ This is universally acknowledged, but the subject has been by no means examined as it deserves to be. Comp. Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das A. T.*, Göttingen 1824, B. iv. S. 242 f.; Hitzig, *Der Prophet Ezechiel*, Leipzig 1847, S. xvi.; Keil, *Einleitung*, Frankfurt-am-Main 1873, S. 296.

ants of Aaron under two branches: the house of Zadok, who remained faithful, and who are termed Levites; and the descendants of Ithamar, who are rejected on account of their unfaithfulness, and who, as well as the sons of Zadok, receive the designation of Levites. This does not imply that the ordinary Levites are excluded, or that they do not exist; that is not the question. Ezekiel could have no possible object in speaking of the Levites here as a class, unless it were for the information of those critics who demand that every Old Testament writer who mentions priests or Levites at all should clearly distinguish them, before they will give up their theories. Ezekiel has there to do with the purification of the priesthood, through the exclusion of those who have offered sacrifices to idols; just as Ezra, in a later age, purifies the Aaronitic priesthood by shutting out those who were of questionable lineage.¹ It may be asked, where is the proof of this?

(2.) We know that the house of Aaron was divided into two branches, Eleazar and Ithamar.² According to the Chronicler,³ all the priests came from these two branches. The line of Ithamar was cursed in the person of Eli.⁴ In the second book of Samuel, Zadok and Abiathar appear side by side in the priesthood,⁵ from which Abiathar, a descendant of

¹ Ezra ii. 62.

² Num. iii. 4.

³ 1 Chron. xxiv. 1-5.

⁴ Comp. 1 Sam. ii. 36; xiv. 3, xxii. 9, 20; 1 Kings ii. 26, 27; 1 Chron. xxiv. 3, 6.

⁵ 2 Sam. xv. 24, 35, xix. 11.

Ithamar, is excluded by Solomon,¹ thus leaving the position of high priest to Zadok alone. Henceforth the posterity of Ithamar occupy an inferior position. Now, when we read the account of Josiah's reformation of the idolatrous priests,² who are called brethren of other priests, and then turn to Ezek. xliv. 10,³ the whole matter becomes clear. In ver. 15 of the same chapter, the priests, the Levites, the sons of Zadok, are mentioned as those who went not astray. Who, then, are the Levites spoken of vers. 10-14, but descendants of Ithamar, who might also be termed Levitical priests, who are degraded from their priestly office on account of their apostasy ?

We claim that this theory, which is supported by tradition, is worthy of respect, especially as we expect to be able to prove in another chapter that the testimony of the Chronicler with reference to the priests and Levites is unimpeachable, Graf to the contrary notwithstanding. If the theory of the modern critics,

¹ 1 Kings ii. 27.

² 2 Kings xxiii. 8, 9. The Mishna, *Menachoth* xiii. 10, in this connection says: "The priests which have served in a heathen temple may not serve in the temple at Jerusalem, and much less those who have served an idol, for it is written (2 Kings xxiii. 9), 'Only the priests of the high places may not approach God's altar in Jerusalem, but they may eat unleavened bread among their brethren.' They are like those who have some bodily defect; they may partake and eat with their brethren, but may not offer." The *Tosefta Menachoth* repeats the same.

³ Maimonides, *Biath ha-Mikdash*, ix. 13, remarks, with reference to this passage, ver. 13, that no priest who has once apostatized, although he turns with true repentance to the pure religion, may ever minister in the sanctuary.

which makes Ezekiel the bridge, is plausible, our interpretation, which is supported by tradition, is quite as much so, and rests on historical facts, while by the other the Pentateuch is subjected to an exorbitant test as to originality in manner and matter. Fancy some German or Dutch professor trying to prove that Kuenen wrote Prof. Smith's article on the Bible in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, because of an unconscious similarity in some of Prof. Smith's thoughts and expressions to those of Prof. Kuenen in his work on the *Religion of Israel*, and you have an example of the length to which such criticism can go.

We now refer to another objection which is often raised: Why, if Ezekiel was familiar with the priestly laws in the Pentateuch, does he deviate so much from them? Surely, if he had had them before him, he would not have changed them.

The limits of this discussion do not allow us to enter into a specific examination of this question. Two or three general remarks must suffice as a reply.

After the destruction of the temple and the captivity of the priesthood, a priest who felt himself divinely inspired, as Ezekiel evidently did, would be entirely unrestrained as to the manner of his composition. Whatever might have been Ezekiel's personal expectations with regard to the future employment of his priestly regulations, he has in fact, like Plato, evidently portrayed an ideal state, which has never yet been realized. But this does not prove that the

last apocalyptic portion of his book may not have exerted a powerful influence in sustaining the drooping spirits of the Jewish captives, just as the description of the New Jerusalem has cheered many a struggling spirit in times of trial. Indeed, what the Book of Revelation has been to the Christian Church, Ezekiel may well have been to the Jewish.

CHAPTER VI.

JOSHUA—2 KINGS.

Summary: Effects of the political changes on the history of the nation
—The Books of Samuel and Kings compared with the Chronicles
—Influence of the period between Moses and David on the priesthood—The high priests—The ephod—Zadok and Abiathar—Hilkiah—Was it the main business of the priests to offer sacrifices?—Levitical priests in the Book of Joshua—The inheritance of the tribe—The two Levites in the Book of Judges—The duties of the priests and Levites according to the Book of Samuel—Was Samuel a Levite?—The Levitical cities—The Levites are mentioned only once in the Books of Kings.

WE now approach a period in the history of Israel which is said by the modern theorists to yield no trace of an Aaronitic priesthood, and which, if it reveals a priesthood at all, only presents the Levitical. The books of Kings especially are cited as showing by their silence that the representations of the Chronicler are untrue. Let us apply the priestly regulations to the condition of the Israelites during the time covered by the historical books from Joshua to the Second Book of Kings, inclusive. We have to inquire whether the condition of the priests, and the tribe of which it is a part, corresponds to what we might expect from the history. Four periods pass under review: (1) That of conquest under Joshua; (2) of political law-

lessness and general disintegration under the judges ; (3) of union and strengthening under Samuel ; (4) of many vicissitudes of glory, division, defeat, shame, and captivity under the kings. If the political history of Israel was subject to such kaleidoscopic changes, what must we expect from the religious history ? Can we suppose that the Jewish Church would be more fortunate than the Christian, or its books of the law more uniform in their influence than our Scriptures ? The historical books of the Old Testament present similar phenomena in the Jewish that ecclesiastical history does in the Christian Church. It is claimed, with great emphasis, that it is most improbable that the regulations of the Pentateuch should have fallen for so long a time into disuse, and then have been restored under Ezra. But does not the history of the Christian Church afford a parallel ? Was there no return to the original apostolic doctrines and simplicity of worship during the Reformation ?

Before we proceed to a special examination, we desire to emphasize another point. It is charged that the books of Samuel and Kings make so little mention of the priests and Levites, that they play a much less important part in the regal period than is assigned them by the Chronicler. The fact that the Chronicler has made such abundant mention of them shows, as Kuenen affirms, what these other writers would have done if his statements were correct. The circumstance that the Chronicler speaks so frequently of the priests is due to the tendency of his book. It was written

especially to show how the institutions of the law were introduced into the life of the people. The Books of Kings have an entirely different purpose. The Chronicles belong to the priestly writings, the Kings to the prophetic. Does silence on the part of a historian prove that a thing did not happen? If so, there would evidently be no room for any new histories. A recent writer has summarily disposed of this objection. There were two public men¹ in England in the seventeenth century who kept diaries at a time when crime held high carnival. One makes the scantiest mention of the dreadful robberies which were then occurring, while the pages of the other teem with details of crime. History, as written from different standpoints, must always afford variety in details. It is certain that in the books which we shall now consider, priests, or the tribe to which they belong, are not mentioned except where their presence is absolutely necessary. This does not prove that the rôle in which they appear in the books of the Chronicler is merely the product of his invention.

Any candid person looking carefully at the history of Israel from the death of Moses until the accession of David, must see that the circumstances were very unfavourable for the influence of the priesthood. Under Joshua, when the people were engaged in war for the attainment of homes, they would have little

¹ The author of *Deuteronomy the People's Book*, p. 136, mentions Evelyn and Luttrell. The incident is taken from Pike's *History of Crime in England*, vol. ii. pp. 274-76.

time for the minute observance of the regulations laid down in the Pentateuch. In such a history as Joshua's, there is no opportunity for speaking of the special functions of the priests. The book, however, indicates that a high priest and priests served at the central sanctuary.

In the Book of Judges, the political situation is still more unfavourable for the growth of the priesthood. There is no strong central government. The land is frequently harassed by marauding bands of Philistines, and is for a season rent by civil war. During much of the time religion is in a very depressed state, owing to the frequent apostasy of the children of Israel. Are we, then, to be surprised when a homeless Levite moves across the scene? Shall we argue from this that the Levites did not possess any cities? The object of the history was not to mention the Levites. They simply come in as an illustration of the lawlessness of the times. It is, however, significant that there is an allusion which implies the use of Urim and Thummim by the high priest when it is said, "The children of Israel asked the Lord."¹ There is a break in the history, and then Eli appears. The conduct of his sons tended to throw contempt on the sacred office. This diminution of influence was still further heightened by the loss of the ark of God and the death of Hophni and Phinehas. Need we wonder at the occurrence of irregularities in worship and the depression of the priesthood in such a state of things?

¹ Judg. i. 1. Compare Num. xxvii. 21.

The consequence of the exceptional circumstances of the time must have been to steadily diminish the authority of the priesthood among the people. Another terrible blow fell upon the priests, when Saul caused the almost total extinction of the descendants of Eli at Nob,¹ so that only one escaped to David. Afterwards, the star of the priesthood, rising with the fortunes of the sons of Jesse, reached its zenith under Solomon.

These preliminary thoughts may perhaps throw light on our more special investigation. We have found nothing to contradict the assumption of a high priest in Deuteronomy. Taken in connection with the preceding books, a succession is clearly indicated in x. 6 : "There Aaron died, and there he was buried ; and Eleazar his son ministered in the priest's office in his stead." The function of the high priest in bearing Urim and Thummim is clearly indicated, as we have already observed.²

In Joshua, which is added by the modern critics as the sixth part to the five books of Moses, we find Eleazar occupying a not inferior position to that of Aaron in the middle books of the Pentateuch. He appears with Joshua in the division of the land and the decision of important questions.³ His name, too, always has the precedence. His son Phinehas maintains the honourable position with which his zeal for God was rewarded when Israel was tempted by the

¹ 1 Sam. xxii. 17-19. *Ibid.* ver. 20.

² See p. 59.

³ Josh. xiv. 1, xvii. 4, xix. 51, xxi. 1.

Midianites.¹ He is sent on an important embassy, in which he appears as the chief speaker.² There is no account given in Joshua of the peculiarly sacerdotal character of the high priest, because the book is filled up with other matters; but it follows as a matter of course that Eleazar served as a high priest, and that Phinehas stood next in the succession. The fact that the death and burial of Eleazar are recorded at the very close of Joshua, is a sure evidence of his high position and influence.³ In Judges, the high priest Phinehas is once, in the history of the war with Benjamin, mentioned as inquiring of God by Urim and Thummim.⁴ Colenso claims that this passage is an interpolation,—a very convenient way of dodging a difficulty.⁵ It cannot, however, be proved that it is not original. It is undoubtedly a stubborn fact, which lies directly across the path of the modern theory. Should it be objected that if there were a high priest, it is strange that this is the only mention which is made of him, let it be remembered that the Book of Judges does not attempt to give any account of the priesthood.

The steps in the succession which we have marked from Aaron through Eleazar suddenly disappear. We are introduced without formality to the house of Eli.

¹ Num. xxv. 7-13.

² Josh. xxii. 13, 30, 31.

³ Josh. xxxiv. 33.

⁴ Judg. xx. 28.

⁵ *Lectures on the Pentateuch and the Moabite Stone*, London 1876, p. 245: "It has manifestly been inserted by some priestly writer, who could not endure that the people should 'ask counsel of Jehovah' except through the intervention of a 'priest the son of Aaron.'"

It is not expressly said that Eli was the high priest. Considering, however, that this expression is generally omitted even in those portions of the Old Testament where the high priest is evidently intended, there is nothing strange in its omission here. And have we any reason to doubt that Eli was the high priest?

The particulars given in the narrative are conditioned by its purpose, which is to introduce Samuel and assign a reason for the judgment which befell the house of Eli and the children of Israel. The prominent position which was held by Eli, and his standing as the representative of the priesthood, can leave no reasonable doubt that he was the high priest. Graf persists in asserting that he was merely a Levite.¹ If it cannot be proved that he was a descendant of Aaron, it certainly cannot be disproved, since it is well known that the children of Aaron were called Levites.²

Before we proceed further, we must again remind the new school of critics of their unreasonable claims upon history in regard to the priesthood. They demand of a narration which was never intended to trace the sacerdotal fortunes, and which merely mentions them incidentally where they are essential, the same explicitness as in the priestly portions of the Pentateuch. Because the high priest does not always receive his title, and does not appear on all occasions in the

¹ *Die Geschichtlichen Bücher*, Leipzig 1866, S. 45.

² Josh. xxi. 4: "And the children of Aaron the priest, which were of the Levites."

splendid regalia described in Exodus,¹ he is, forsooth, only “the first among his equals.”²

What is this but an argument that the silence of certain books in regard to these particulars proves that they did not exist?

Turning now to the descendants of Eli, we find Ahia, who is perhaps the same as Ahimelech, or his brother, mentioned as wearing the ephod in Shiloh. We know from Exodus that the ephod³ was an important part of the high priest’s apparel when he ministered before the Lord. The ephod worn by Samuel,⁴ by the ordinary priests,⁵ and by David⁶ when dancing before the ark of the covenant of the Lord, is carefully distinguished as being of linen.⁷ The natural inference is, that this garment which was worn by Ahimelech is the same in kind as that which is assigned in Exodus to the high priest.⁸ Everything that we read about Ahimelech confirms the impression that his position in the kingdom under Saul corresponds to that of Aaron in the wilderness. His genealogy is carefully traced from Eli.⁹ He is evidently accustomed to the use of Urim and Thummim, as appears from Saul’s complaint,¹⁰

¹ Ex. xxviii. 4-39.

² Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, London 1874-75, vol. ii. p. 169.

³ Ex. xxviii. 4-35. ⁴ 1 Sam. ii. 18. ⁵ 1 Sam. xxii. 18.

⁶ 2 Sam. vi. 14. Comp. 1 Chron. xv. 27.

⁷ The ephod of the high priest, according to Ex. xxviii. 6, was to be made of gold, of blue, and of purple, of scarlet and fine twined linen, with cunning work.

⁸ The idolatrous ephods mentioned in Judg. viii. 27, xvii. 5, were undoubtedly of a different kind.

⁹ 1 Sam. xiv. 3.

¹⁰ 1 Sam. xxii. 11-13.

“Thou hast given him bread and a sword, and hast then inquired of God for him.” He is addressed by Saul as the head and representative of the priests.¹ His son Abiathar escaped to David with an ephod in his hand.² There is nothing to prevent our understanding this of the official one which had been worn by his father, since it is not necessary to suppose that all at once we have to do with another kind, or that inquiring of the Lord by the ephod³ is any different from inquiring of Him by Urim and Thummim.⁴ All the methods of transmitting divine information seem to be indicated by the same writer:⁵ “And when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets.”

It may, however, be objected that, under David, Zadok and Abiathar are mentioned as priests without distinction.⁶ It is true that they are not distinguished in title, but they are in fact. Zadok’s name always stands before that of Abiathar, because the historian speaks of them from his own standpoint, although Abiathar at the time really had the precedence. He mentions them together as priests, because the one succeeded the

¹ 1 Sam. xxii. 11, 12.

² *Ibid.* xxii. 20, xxiii. 6.

³ 1 Sam. xxiii. 9, 10, xxx. 7, 8.

⁴ Ex. xxviii. 30; Lev. viii. 7, 8; Num. xxvii. 21.

⁵ 1 Sam. xxviii. 6.

⁶ Such seems to be the opinion of Josephus, who says, *Antiq.* vii. 5. 4: *ἀπέδειξε δὲ ἐκ τῆς Φινεάτου οικίας τὸν Σάδωκον ἀρχιερέα μετ' Ἀβιαθάρον*, “He appointed Zadok, from the house of Phinehas, as high priest with Abiathar.” Although this view is favoured by some of the Rabbins (comp. 2 Sam. viii. 17), yet it seems to be clearly contradicted by 1 Kings ii. 35.

other in the same office, and because, even during David's reign, Zadok, although not yet high priest, was superior to Abiathar in influence. On account of the latter's treasonable inclination towards Adonijah, he is deposed from his position:¹ “ So Solomon thrust out Abiathar from being priest unto the Lord, that he might fulfil the word of the Lord which He spake concerning the house of Eli in Shiloh, . . . and Zadok the priest did the king put in the room of Abiathar.”²

From this it appears that until the deposition of Abiathar he outranked Zadok.

Since the author of Kings does not attempt to trace the history of the high priests, we hear nothing more of them until Jehoiada appears. His piety and unusual energy of character, in connection with his commanding position, enable him to place the youthful Joash on the throne, over whom for some time he exerts a salutary influence.³

If we follow the usual interpretation of the middle books of the Pentateuch, we naturally conclude that he was the high priest. Under Ahaz the servile Uriah appears.⁴ Ahaz reigned sixteen years.⁵ How long Uriah's priesthood continued we cannot determine, nor do we know the character of his predecessor. We find him compliant to a wicked king. Whether Hilkiah, by whom the book of the law was found, who is called high priest,⁶ immediately succeeded him is uncertain.

¹ 1 Kings i. 19, ii. 22.

² 1 Kings ii. 27, 35b, iv. 4.

³ 2 Kings xi. 4, xii. 2.

⁴ 2 Kings xvi. 11.

⁵ 2 Kings xvi. 2.

⁶ 2 Kings xxii. 8.

At any rate, the high priest here appears with his full title, and is distinguished from the priests of the second order.¹ The line which began with Aaron ends at the exile with Seraiah, who is executed by the king of Babylon at Riblah.² Are we not, in view of these notices, led to suppose that there were high priests from the beginning to the end of this period? If we accept the usual as distinguished from the critical view is there really any difficulty in recognising high priests in all those whom we have mentioned? It seems to us that any other supposition can only arise from an entirely false analysis and a distortion of history.

As the books which we are considering only furnish scattered and incomplete notices of the high priests, so they are equally wanting in definite information with regard to the priests and Levites. We have, however, no right to conclude that the priests did not offer sacrifice, because this duty is rarely³ assigned them in

¹ 2 Kings xxiii. 4.

² 2 Kings xxv. 18–21.

³ That no one has a right to conclude from this that sacrifices were not usually offered by the priests, appears from the following analysis:—The author of Joshua mentions the priests thirty-one times: nineteen times as crossing the Jordan and marching around the devoted cities (iii. 3–vi. 16); eight times under the names of Eleazar and Phinehas, who are engaged in judicial and diplomatic functions (xiv. 1, xvii. 4, xix. 51, xxi. 1, xxii. 13–32, xxiv. 33); thrice as recipients of cities (xix. 51, xxi. 4, xiii. 19); once as engaged in the ceremony of blessing and cursing (viii. 33, 34): hence there was no place in any of these transactions for sacrifice. Judges, in thirteen places, speaks of a Levite as priest (xvii. 5–xviii. 30), but makes no mention of sacrifice. In the Books of Samuel the word priest occurs thirty-four times. Eli and his sons are designated officially eight times (1 Sam. i. 3–ii. 35). It is implied in ii. 12–17, 28, 29, that Eli's sons offered sacrifices, but only in order to

the 139 places where they are mentioned; or that the Levites did not perform the same duties as are required in the middle books of the Pentateuch, because out of twenty-eight references to them only one or two¹ seem to indicate their special calling, or that there are no priestly and Levitical cities because scant mention is made of them. For, as we have already observed, priests and Levites are only introduced by the historian as constituent parts of a narration, without special regard to their ordinary functions or their private property.

In Joshua, Levitical priests are mentioned as moving in procession,² or simply as descendants from Levi

illustrate their service. The servants of Dagon and some sons and servants of David received the same title (1 Sam. v. 5, vi. 2; 2 Sam. viii. 18, xx. 26). The priests at Nob are mentioned six times (1 Sam. xxii. 11-21). Ahimelech, Zadok, and Abiathar are mentioned eighteen times (1 Sam. xiv. 3, 19, 36, xxi. 1-9, xxii. 11, 17, 18-21, xxiii. 9, xxx. 7; 2 Sam. viii. 17, xv. 27, 35, xvii. 15, xix. 11, xx. 25). In these references nothing could be said of the priests offering sacrifice unless in 1 Sam. xiv. 35. Out of sixty references to the priests in the Books of Kings, thirty-two are made to high priests (1 Kings i. 7-45, ii. 22-35, iv. 2-4; 2 Kings xi. 9, 10, 15, xii. 2, 7, 9, xvi. 10-16, xxii. 10-14, xxiii. 24, 25); in none of these except in xvi. 15, 16, is it implied that the priests offered sacrifices. The remaining twenty-eight mention others as priests, but as engaged in various occupations not including sacrifice (1 Kings iv. 5, viii. 3-11, xii. 31, 32, xiii. 2, 33; 2 Kings x. 11, 19, xi. 18, xii. 4-6, 8, 16, xvii. 27-32, xxiii. 2-20, xxv. 18). A comparison of these passages will show that the occupations of the priests of the Lord are in no way inconsistent with what is said of them in the middle books of the Pentateuch.

¹ 1 Kings viii. 4. Perhaps 1 Sam. vi. 15, as has already been remarked, refers to the priests.

² Josh. iii. 3, 6, 14, vi. 4.

through Aaron in the receipt of their cities.¹ The term Levites alone is only used of the entire tribe, to whom, in the distribution of the land, cities are assigned. It is claimed that the following verses show that all the members of the tribe of Levi were eligible to the priesthood :²—“ Only unto the tribe of Levi he gave none inheritance ; the sacrifices of the Lord God of Israel made by fire are their inheritance, as He said unto them.” “ But the Levites have no part among you ; for the priesthood of the Lord is their inheritance.”³

If we were to admit that these passages prove that any Levite might become a priest, we could not suppose in any case that the sacrifices of the Lord made by fire, or that the office of the priesthood, could furnish a support for more than a part of the tribe,—that is, for those who were really performing the priest's office. The only way in which the priesthood could become the inheritance of the whole tribe, would be through the patronage which would fall to them, and the many subordinate offices which the mass of the tribe could perform. Take away the priesthood, and these minor offices would no longer exist. That this general meaning is correct, appears from these words :⁴ “ But unto the tribe of Levi Moses gave not any inheritance ; the Lord God of Israel was their inheritance, as He said unto them.” If, however, the priesthood was the inheritance of the entire tribe in the way which we

¹ Josh. xxi. 4.

² *Ibid.* xiii. 14.

³ *Ibid.* xviii. 7.

⁴ *Ibid.* xiii. 33.

have indicated, the remark is equally true if we confine it to the children of Aaron, who, as we have already seen, were reckoned as Levites.

Colenso implies that there was no tribe of Levi in the time of Deborah, because it is not mentioned in her song.¹ This objection is not of the slightest significance, except as a specimen of many of his objections. Since the report of Josephus² is probably correct, that the Levites were excused from military duty,³ there would be no occasion for mentioning them here, where the attitude of other tribes towards the battle is characterized.

The two Levites⁴ who appear in the Book of Judges scarcely require any further notice after what has already been said. They are examples of the unsettled condition of the times, but give no certain testimony of the state of their tribe. To argue that the Levites never received any possession, because one of them is here represented as homeless,⁵ is absurd. Nor can it be inferred that any Levite might become a priest of the Lord from the choice of this one by Micah. A man who had broken the second⁶ and eighth⁷ commandments, and probably knew very little about the law, might well be glad to secure one who stood so near the priesthood as the Levites to serve as priest. Nor is it strange that, when Israel so frequently lapsed

¹ Colenso, *Lectures on the Pentateuch*, p. 245.

² *Antiquities*, iii. 12. 4, iv. 4. 3.

³ Saalschütz, *Das Mosäische Recht*, Berlin 1853, S. 105.

⁴ Judg. xvii. 7, xix. 1.

⁵ Judg. xvii. 8.

⁶ Judg. xvii. 5.

⁷ Judg. xvii. 2.

into idolatry,¹ the Danites should establish this same Levite and his descendants among them as priests to their idol.² The other Levite finds a place in a story of shame and violence, not at all on account of his official character, but because of the connection of the incident with the terrible decimation which befell the tribe of Benjamin.³ He is mentioned as sojourning on the side of Mount Ephraim, perhaps in one of the suburbs of Shechem.⁴ He seems to have been in comfortable circumstances, as he had a servant and a couple of asses.⁵ After his concubine, who had left him, had become reconciled to him, it was his purpose to go to the house of the Lord,⁶ perhaps to minister as his⁷ brethren the Levites did, or to express his gratitude for the reconciliation of his companion. Of this, however, we know nothing definitely. The Book of Judges gives no account of the priests or Levites as a class. If the circumstances of the first Levite seem to denote that he had no settled residence, those of the second seem to indicate that he was living in one of the Levitical suburbs.

In the Books of Samuel, neither the duties of the priests nor of the Levites are specifically described. Colenso claims that very few priests were requisite for the temple service.⁸ The fact that only Eli's sons are mentioned as officiating at Shiloh might seem to lend

¹ Judg. ii. 11-19, iii. 7, iv. 1, vi. 1, x. 6, xiii. 1.

² Judg. xviii. 30, 31.

³ Judg. xix. 14, xxi. 3.

⁴ Judg. xix. 1; comp. Josh. xxi. 21.

⁵ Judg. xix. 3.

⁶ Judg. xix. 18.

⁷ Deut. xviii. 7.

⁸ Colenso, *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua*, Part iii. pp. 484, 485: "We cannot wonder that in Solomon's as in David's time we

some colour to this supposition. The object of the narrative, however, is not to accurately portray the arrangements of the house of God at Shiloh, giving the number of priests and Levites, but simply to recount the judgment which befell Eli and his two sons. One might also infer from the reference to Ahimelech at Nob, that he was almost the only priest there,¹ if the massacre had never occurred which affords a reason for speaking of eighty-five priests who fell by the sword.² The Levites are only twice referred to by name in the Books of Samuel. The Levites take down the ark of the covenant on its return from the Philistines.³ Levites are mentioned as accompanying Zadok and Abiathar in the retreat of King David.⁴ These passages are so indefinite, that neither side can base an argument on them. It must, however, be admitted that the name was undoubtedly chosen so as to include those who were not priests.

There is, however, a more specific mention of a Levite who afterwards occupies an exceptionally prominent position. We refer to Samuel. It is asserted that he could not have been a Levite, because his father is termed an Ephrathite.⁵ This argument cannot hold, since a Levite is spoken of as being out of

read of only *two* priests (1 Kings iv. 4), who had doubtless some attendants; or that in Zedekiah's time the whole body of ecclesiastics employed at the temple was only *five*." But what does this prove?

¹ 1 Sam. xxi. 1-10.

² *Ibid.* xxii. 18.

³ *Ibid.* vi. 15.

⁴ 2 Sam. xv. 24.

⁵ Colenso, *Lectures on the Pentat.*, London 1876, p. 248. Graf, in *Merx's Archiv*, B. i. S. 72, says that Samuel was not a Levite, but

Bethlehem-Judah, of the family of Judah. If a Levite can be said, by virtue of his residence in one of the cities of Judah, to be of the family of Judah, then a Levite from one of the cities of Ephraim can be said to be an Ephrathite. While we should naturally have expected that Elkanah, if a Levite, would have been designated as such, the omission is not very strange in a book where the Levites are only mentioned twice. Colenso claims that Samuel could not have belonged to the Levites, because his consecration by his mother to the service of the Lord would have been superfluous and unmeaning, since the whole tribe belonged to the Lord.¹ There was, however, a special reason for this consecration, in the fact that all Levites could serve at the sanctuary, but not all of them really served, and by no means from childhood. The establishment of this point that Samuel was a Levite, and that he afterwards offered sacrifices, does not prove that all Levites exercised the same privilege. He was an exceptional person, who arose at a period when a terrible judgment fell upon the priesthood and upon the central sanctuary at Shiloh; hence, while he probably never exercised full sacerdotal functions, he felt himself empowered to offer sacrifices.

was made one by the Chronicler, 1 Chron. vi. 7-13 (E. V. 22-28). But it is an interesting coincidence that the Chronicler makes Samuel a descendant of Kohath, and that his father probably lived in one of the suburbs which had been assigned to the Kohathites, Josh. xxi. 21. "For they gave them Shechem with her suburbs in Mount Ephraim."

¹ 1 Sam. i. 11.

As regards the cities of the priests and Levites, we may well believe that one of them is indicated as the birthplace of Samuel. Another is Beth-shemesh, to which the two milch cows carried the ark of the Lord.¹ That this city had really been given to the Levites of the family of Aaron in the time of Joshua,² appears (1) from the plan of the Philistines for returning the ark; if the cows would leave their calves without any human direction for a priestly city, it would be evident that the God of Israel had afflicted them.³ (2) That Beth-shemesh was a priestly city, is confirmed by the presence of Levites, who were probably priests, sons of Aaron, as appears from their handling the ark, which was only allowed to be handled by the priests, and from the offering of sacrifices.⁴

Graf⁵ lays great weight on the fact that Nob is not mentioned in the list of priestly cities. But when we remember the many disturbances which had occurred, it would not be strange if the priests were compelled to take other cities than those which were originally assigned, unless perhaps Nob is one of the old cities under another name.⁶ Moreover, this place might have been specially chosen on account of Saul, who was from Benjamin. In the same connection, it is interesting to recall Solomon's words to Abiathar when dismissing him from the high-priesthood:⁷ "Get thee

¹ 1 Sam. vi. 12.

² Josh. xxi. 16.

³ 1 Sam. vi. 9.

⁴ 1 Sam. vi. 15.

⁵ *Merx's Archiv*, S. 84.

⁶ Its situation has not yet been accurately determined.

⁷ 1 Kings ii. 26.

to Anathoth, unto thine own fields, for thou art worthy of death ;”¹ and the opening of Jeremiah : “ The words of Jeremiah, the son of Hilkiah, of the priests that were in Anathoth, in the land of Benjamin.”² It will be remembered that this is the same city which is assigned to the priests in the Book of Joshua.

We certainly have a right to dismiss Graf’s assertion, that there is not a single trace of such cities for priests and Levites in trustworthy historical accounts, as unfounded, since we have found scattered notices which show on their very face that they were never written to confirm the statement in Joshua, and hence cannot come under the suspicion even of Kuenen’s school.

The Book of Kings, in the only passage where the Levites are mentioned, distinguishes them from the priests :³ “ And they brought up the ark of the Lord, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and all the holy vessels that were in the tabernacle, even those did the priests and the Levites bring up.” The last clause is claimed to have been changed from the original, and reduces Kuenen to such straits that he betakes himself to the despised Book of Chronicles for a correction :⁴ “ And they brought up the ark of the Lord, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and all the holy vessels that were in the tabernacle, even those did the priests and the Levites bring up.”⁵ The assump-

¹ 1 Kings ii. 26.

² Jer. i. 1.

³ 1 Kings viii. 4.

⁴ Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 301.

⁵ Compare 2 Chron. v. 5.

tion of a “clerical error” is not enough to destroy the force of this passage in a case where the text is beyond a question. It may, however, be affirmed that there is one passage in this book where the priests are clearly characterized as Levitical:¹ “And he (Jeroboam) made a house of high places, and made priests of the lowest of the people, which were not of the sons of Levi.” This, however, does not prove that any Levite as such might become a priest; for (1) we might understand the passage to mean that Jeroboam chose priests from the lowest of the people who were not even Levites; but (2) he is undoubtedly represented as not choosing from the descendants of Aaron, who, in relation to their tribe, are called Levites.² That the latter unquestionably is the proper interpretation of the passage, appears from the Chronicler’s³ version of the same fact, who, according to Graf, always strictly discriminates between the priests and the Levites:⁴ “And the priests and the Levites that were in Israel resorted to him out of all their coasts. For the Levites left their suburbs and their possession, and came to Judah and Jerusalem; for Jeroboam and his sons had cast

¹ 1 Kings xii. 31, xiii. 33. These passages evidently recognise the law in Num. iii. 10: “And thou shalt appoint Aaron and his sons, and they shall wait on the priest’s office: and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death.”

² Josh. xxi. 3, 4: “And the children of Israel gave unto the Levites out of their inheritance. . . . And the lot came out for the families of the Kohathites: and the children of Aaron the priest, which were of the Levites,” etc.

³ 2 Chron. xi. 13, 14; compare xiii. 9-11.

⁴ *Die Geschichtlichen Bücher*, Leipzig 1866, S. 46.

them off from executing the priest's office unto the Lord."

Our object in this chapter has not been to critically examine the text of Joshua—2 Kings with reference to the age of its component parts, but rather to see whether, if we start with the supposition that the middle books of the Pentateuch (Exodus—Numbers), substantially as they are at present, were composed in the time of Moses, and that Deuteronomy was uttered by him, we can trace an historical organism which is illustrated by the history of the Christian Church; or whether it is necessary for us to reconstruct the entire history as best we can, according to the modern theory of development. It seems to us that all the phenomena which we have observed, warrant us in holding that the Aaronitic priesthood was founded by God in the time of Moses, and that the vicissitudes through which it passed until the reformation under Josiah were due partly to political changes, and more than all to the natural tendency of the human heart to apostatize from God.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE CHRONICLER.

Summary : The author of the Books of Chronicles—His authorities—His alleged invention of Levitical genealogies—Samuel—Obed-edom—The reason why the house of Ithamar is destitute of a genealogy—The Chronicler as an arithmetician—The sources of the post-exilic history—The high priest—The sons of Aaron—The Levitical priests—The use of the word Levites—The Chronicler as an authority for the regal period—Colenso's attacks.

THE greatest variety of opinion exists in regard to this much-abused book. If it can be conclusively proved to be veritable history, then the theories of Graf, Kuenen, and Kayser fall to the ground. If, on the other hand, it can be proved that the author, whether intentionally or otherwise, has changed the history in accordance with his views, our defence will lose something of its strength, although even the removal of this prop would not destroy it.

That it was written by a Levite is very probable. That he has ascribed the priestly regulations which are claimed to have been first in vogue after the exile, to David and Solomon, we are not prepared to admit.¹

¹ Graf, *Die Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 122–123, etc., compares the standpoint of the author of Chronicles with that of a Catholic Church historian of the Middle Ages or of the present time with

Whether he had the Books of Samuel and Kings before him, or some common source from which both were taken, it is not necessary to decide. It is interesting to notice that, in making quotations, he usually copies with remarkable correctness. It is certain that at the time of the author of Kings there must have been several other historical works in existence, namely, the annals of the kings of Judah and Israel, beginning with David and the division of the kingdom, as well as prophetic writings on the history of that time and the life of contemporary prophets. The same is true in the time of the Chronicler. He often refers to works where a fuller description of the events of which he treats may be found.¹

reference to the arrangements of his Church: "As the latter refers the doctrine and constitution of the Church in its entire maturity, by virtue of a presupposed immutable tradition, to Jesus and the apostles,—not after his own arbitrary supposition, but according to the opinion of his Church received through oral and written teaching,—so the former, as he refers everything which had become established in law and usage to Moses, traces all the arrangements of the temple as they existed at his time, so far as they were not already in the law of Moses, to David as the founder of the temple." This is, however, by no means a parallel case. The absurdity of referring the doctrine and constitution of the Roman Catholic Church to Christ and His apostles, is apparent to every unprejudiced student of the New Testament; not so, however, the assignment of the highest development of the priestly service to the time of the splendid Solomonic temple. The latter supposition is far more reasonable than to suppose that he was drawing a flattering picture of the priestly arrangements as they existed in his own time. Moreover, the arrangements of divine worship at the time of the Chronicler are too little known for us to identify them with the Davidic or Solomonic.

¹ See Appendix I.

Either these references are true or they are fictitious. If fictitious, it is difficult to see how he could escape exposure. If true, his contemporaries certainly had the means of judging of the truth or falsity of his statements. If he copied so literally from the Books of Samuel and Kings, or their common sources, why should he not also from his other sources? It has been asked, if these fuller and better accounts were in existence, why were they not preserved?¹ We reply, because a shorter compilation, not to speak of its sacred character, would be more likely to be preserved amid the changing fortunes of the people than the larger. Each author has his particular purpose in writing. The history of the same country during the same periods may appear in many different lights, according as the historian is chiefly interested in portraying the martial exploits of a people, their social peculiarities, or their religious characteristics. Different classes of authors employ different terms in describing the same things. A layman's terminology would be very different, where he had occasion to speak of ecclesiastical matters, from that of a clergyman.

We now assert that it has not been and cannot be proved, that the Chronicler's representations in regard to the priests and Levites do not rest upon what seemed to him and his contemporaries credible authorities. Let us examine the matter more in detail. Kuenen says that during David's reign and that of his immediate successors, the competence of every Israelite

¹ Graf, *Die Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 118.

to offer sacrifices as priest was not doubted.¹ But where is such a statement made in any of the passages cited? These places, as Kuenen himself admits,² simply show that certain privileged persons were allowed to offer sacrifices. If these passages teach the competence of every Israelite to offer sacrifice, then the priestly Chronicler teaches it with equal force,—a fact which is quite inconceivable if the above passages prove that in David's time any one might minister as priest.³

It is said that the Chronicler has been so desirous to conform the history in every particular to the demands of the priestly legislation, that he has manufactured a Levitical genealogy for those who engaged in sacred services which were allowed only to the

¹ Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, vol. i. p. 338.

² *Ibid.*: "It was the kings and the heads of the tribes and families especially who made use of this privilege."

³ Kuenen, *ibid.*, quotes in support of his theory 1 Sam. xiii. 9, of Saul; 2 Sam. vi. 17, 18 (comp. 1 Chron. xvi. 2), xxiv. 18 seq. (comp. 1 Chron. xxi. 18 seq.); 1 Kings viii. (comp. 2 Chron. v. 6; 1 Chron. xxix. 21), ix. 25 (comp. 2 Chron. viii. 12, 13). In his *Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek*, Leiden 1861, I. 119, note 15, comparing 1 Kings ix. 25 with 2 Chron. viii. 12–16, he remarks: "Nowhere, perhaps, does the effort of the Chronicler to efface the traces of the unlawful service of Yahveh appear more plainly than here." If, however, he holds that we are to understand from 1 Kings ix. 25, that Solomon burned incense in person on the altar of the Lord, he certainly might infer the same from Solomon's message to Hiram, 2 Chron. ii. 3 (E. V. 4): "Behold, I build a house to the name of the Lord my God, to dedicate it to Him, and to burn before Him sweet incense." Did the Chronicler forget himself when he varied so from 1 Kings v. 19 (E. V. v. 5), where nothing is said of incense? Evidently, if we accept Kuenen's theory, he must have done so.

priests and Levites.¹ According to this theory, Samuel, as we have already seen, was made into a Levite by a fictitious genealogy.² But since mere Levites were not allowed, according to the priestly legislation, to offer sacrifice, why did not the Chronicler, who so anxiously sought to remodel the priestly legislation, make a priestly genealogy for Samuel, and connect him distinctly with the house of Aaron? Again, as the ark of the Lord remained three months in the house of Obed-edom, the Chronicler gratifies his inclination for fabricating Levitical ancestries, by making him a descendant of Levi.³ Again, the Chronicler,

¹ Colenso, *Lectures on the Pentateuch*, Part i. pp. 339 and 345. In the latter place he remarks: "He is capable of inventing such genealogies, with a whole array of names and numbers, to any extent, when the occasion seems to call them forth." Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, vol. iii. p. 78, does not regard the Chronicler as the originator of these fictitious genealogies. He says: "By the year 250 B.C. . . . the conviction had become established that it was necessary that every one who was admitted in any capacity whatever into the service of the temple should be a descendant of Levi. In conformity with this, the families and lineages in which the office of singer or porter had gradually become hereditary, were also regarded then as Levitical families, and traced back by ingenious pedigrees to the tribe-father Levi."

² Compare Gramberg, *Die Chronik*, u. s. w., Halle 1823, S. 126. Graf, in *Merx's Archiv*, S. 72: "Samuel, according to 1 Sam. i. 1, as well as according to the entire contents of 1 Sam. i.-iii., was no Levite by birth, but he was made one, 1 Chron. vi. 7-13 and 18-23 (E. V. 22-28, 33-38), etc."

³ Graf, in *Merx's Archiv*, S. 73, says: "In Chronicles, this former keeper of the ark of the covenant is represented as the ancestor of a numerous race of temple wardens, and is brought into connection with the tribe of Levi in different ways by intricate genealogies, through which their historical untenability most plainly appears."

who was probably well read in Hebrew literature, finds himself in such want of names for his three musical directors, that he adds those of two famous wise men, Heman and Ethan, for whom in due course he finds an honourable place in the family of Levi.¹ If, however, this theory is correct, that there was a tendency to connect all who had participated in the affairs of divine service with the tribe of Levi,² we should expect to see it exemplified in other cases than those which are mentioned.

If he made a Levite of Obed-edom, in whose house the ark rested for three months, why not of Abinadab, where the ark was kept for a much longer time? As his son Eleazar was sanctified to keep the ark,³ the Chronicler ought to have made a priest of him.

Again, it is objected that the genealogy of the descendants of Aaron, as given in the Chronicles, is worthless, except from Zadok, for the following reasons:

¹ Graf, *Die Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 224, says: "The passage in 1 Kings v. 11 (E. V. iv. 31) knows nothing about the Levitical descent of Ethan and Heman, but Ethan is rather called an Ezrahite; and so both of them, even according to 1 Chron. ii. 6, as sons of Zerah, belong to Judah; comp. Ps. lxxxviii. 1, lxxxix. 1. But here their descent with that of Asaph, like that of Samuel, is traced back to Levi, and the appointment of all of them to David." Comp. Graf in *Merx's Archiv*, 1869, S. 72-73; and also Delitzsch in the introduction to Ps. lxxxviii. and lxxxix.

² Graf, *Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 223, says: "The foundation of these family registers is designed to prove that the men of earlier times, who are named as participating in the affairs of divine service, also belonged genealogically to the tribe of Moses and Aaron, and thereby, according to later ideas, acquired their right to engage in divine services."

³ 1 Sam. vii. 1.

(1.) His genealogy rests on the presupposition that the rank of high priest was inherited in an unbroken line from Eleazar, thus contradicting the history in Samuel and Kings. (2.) The repetition of the names Amariah, Ahitub, and Zadok in the same order looks suspicious. (3.) The twenty-two names are sufficient to fill out the time from Aaron to the exile, if forty years are reckoned to each.¹ These objections admit of the following answers:—

(1.) While we might infer from 1 Chron. v. 30–40,² and especially from vi. 34–38,³ that all the individuals named exercised the priest's office, it is possible that those members of the line who were contemporaries of Eli and his descendants did not exercise the office of high priest. In the absence of sufficient historical data, the particulars with reference to the Aaronitic family from Abishua to Ahitub are enveloped in obscurity. The fact, however, that Eli, Ahia, Abimelech and Abiathar, of the house of Ithamar, are represented as occupying the high priest's office, does not throw doubt on the validity of the genealogy from Eleazar to Zadok. It is wrong when Graf claims that the Chronicler purposely drops Eli and Abiathar out of the history.⁴ Since he first begins to relate the history of Israel with the death of Saul,⁵ there is no room for Eli. He does not try to ignore Abiathar, as

¹ Compare Graf, *Die Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 221–222. *Merx's Archiv*, B. i. S. 71.

² E. V. vi. 4–14.

⁴ *Merx's Archiv*, B. i. S. 72.

³ E. V. vi. 49–52.

⁵ 1 Chron. x.

Graf would have us believe, and put in his place Ahimelech, whose existence we are told is due to the error of a transcriber.¹ He really mentions Zadok and Abiathar² together. If it had been the Chronicler's purpose to expunge Abiathar from the history, and his only sources had been the Books of Samuel and the Kings, he would certainly have improved the opportunity afforded in Kings, where the deposition of Abiathar by Solomon is spoken of; but we hear nothing of the kind. He rather represents that a descendant of Ithamar, Ahimelech³ the son of Abiathar,

¹ Graf, *Die Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 237-238: "Dieser Ahimelek, Sohn Abjathar's welcher hier dem Zadok an die Seite gestellt wird, ist nur das Ergebniss eines Schreibfehlers; . . . und so benutzt nun der Chronist der den Abjathar selbst den von Salomo vom Hohenpriesterthum Verworfenen (1 Kön. ii. 27) nicht gern neben Zadok nennt, vgl. 1 Chron. xvi. 37 ff., ihn vielmehr ignorirt (wie ja auch der um Samuel's willen verworfene Eli in den späteren Genealogien keine Stelle mehr hat), diesen Ahimelek zu seiner Darstellung."

² 1 Chron. xv. 11.

³ It must be admitted that the mention of Ahimelech at the side of Zadok, when we should rather have expected Abiathar, affords some difficulty. If 2 Sam. viii. 17 stood alone, we might, perhaps, suppose that the Syrian and Arabic versions, which transpose the order of the words to "Abiathar son of Ahimelech," contained the right reading. This, however, as well as Wellhausen's proposed transposition of the verse so as to read, "Abiathar the son of Ahitub and Zadok" (*Der Text der Bücher Samuel's*, Göttingen 1871, S. 177), cannot be allowed, since the same thing occurs in 1 Chron. xviii. 16, where Abimelech is equivalent to Ahimelech, and xxiv. 3, 6, 31. We have no right to assume, with Graf, that the Chronicler has founded his representations in 1 Chron. xxiv. 1-19 on a mistake of a transcriber. The dogmatism with which Graf makes this assertion is surprising. There are two explanations which have been suggested by those who are not willing to do violence to the text:—(1.) That Abiathar and

is priest. The priestly Chronicler evidently entertains no fears of bringing suspicion on the priestly genealogy from Eleazar by the mention of another priest with Zadok, who seems to be on a par with him.

The misfortunes which befell the house of Ithamar through Eli, undoubtedly left them without a genealogy.

(2.) It seems strange that Graf should have laid so much weight on the repetition of the names Amariah, Ahitub, and Zadok twice,¹ or that Bertheau should have acknowledged the force² of Graf's objection. A man who has illustrated his theory of the fictitious part of the priestly genealogy from Zadok to Aaron by a reference to the line of popes which is carried back to Peter,³ might have seen in the undoubtedly his-

Abimelech are two names for the same person. This explanation, with slight variations, is supported by Sanctius, and in Polus on 2 Sam. viii. 17, Selden (Ugolini, *Thesaurus*, tom. xii. p. 236), and by Ugolini himself (tom. xiii. p. 852). (2.) That Ahimelech was a son of Abiathar, and was appointed for some reason unknown to us, while his father was still living (either on account of age or some bodily infirmity). This view is sustained by Kimchi (on 2 Sam. viii. 17), Tostatus and Corn. à Lapide in Polus, Oehler (Herzog's *Real-Encycl.* B. 6, S. 205), Keil (1 Chron. xviii. 15), and Bertheau. That this list, as well as others, is founded on an old document, appears from 1 Chron. xxiv. 6, according to which Shemaiah the son of Nathaniel the scribe, one of the Levites, is said to have recorded the classes of the priests as they had been determined by lot.

¹ *Die Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 222.

² *Die Bücher der Chronik*, 2 Aufl., Leipzig 1873, S. 59.

³ Graf, *Die Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 221, says: "The enumeration of the names, 1 Chron. v. 30-41 (E. V. vi. 4-15), is intended to represent the succession of high priests from Eleazar to the exile, and therefore traces his succession in a direct line back to Aaron, as the Catholic Church traces the succession of their popes up to Peter."

torical portion of the pontifical succession, that the same names occur with a suspicious frequency; indeed, a large portion of the list looks as though it was manufactured!¹

(3.) The third objection represents the Chronicler as an arithmetician, who, dividing nine hundred by forty, which is said to be a suspicious number, finds that twenty-two priests are necessary. If this was the Chronicler's rule, it was not that of subsequent writers.² It must be acknowledged that the average is high;³ but when we compare it with that of the

¹ Honorius II.	.	1124	Celestine III.	.	1191
Innocent II.	.	1130	Innocent III.	.	1198
Celestine II.	.	1143	Honorius III.	.	1216
Innocent X.	.	1644	Clement X.	.	1670
Alexander VII.	.	1655	Innocent XI.	.	1676
Clement IX.	.	1667	Alexander VIII.	.	1681

Benedict and Clement occur in pairs four times. Compare with the above the following repetition of names in the English history:

Edward II.	.	1307	Edward IV.	.	1461
Edward III.	.	1327	Edward V.	.	1483
Richard II.	.	1377	Richard III.	.	1483
Henry IV.	.	1399	Henry VII.	.	1485
Henry V.	.	1413	Henry VIII.	.	1509

² "The entire number of the priests, according to Josephus (*Antiq. xx. 10. 10*), is eighty-three. Of these, there were thirteen until the time of the Solomonic temple, during this temple eighteen, and after the exile fifty-two. . . . The number is greater in the Talmud, where even eighty are recorded for the period after the exile (Jerusalem, *Joma* i. 1, *Midr. r. 3 m., Absch. 21*)."—*Hamburger Real-Encyclopädie*, Berlin 1870, S. 847.

³ A quotation from *Joma 9a* is interesting in this connection:—"The fear of the Lord prolongeth days, that is the first temple, which stood four hundred and ten years, and not more than

reign of English and French sovereigns, who averaged about twenty-three years,¹ it cannot be proved to have been impossible, if we remember the great ages of Aaron and Eli.² At the same time, it is not improbable that some links are missing in the genealogical chain, as in the genealogies of Moses³ and of Christ.⁴

We are told that while the Books of Chronicles are almost worthless for that history which they claim to portray, they are very valuable as enabling us to form a conception of the state of things after the exile.⁵ It is said that the high priest nowhere appears in the glory and power which he only possessed after the exile, except in the middle books of the Pentateuch. We of course turn with fond expectation to the Book of Chronicles, as a mirror of the post-exilic times, to find this picture of the high priest adorned with the splendid mitre, the breastplate sparkling with precious stones, the costly ephod, and the golden bells which announced his coming.⁶ It is unreasonable

eighteen priests ministered in it. But the years of the wicked shall be shortened, that is the second temple, which stood four hundred and twenty years, and there ministered in it more than three hundred priests.”

¹ There have been thirty-five English and French sovereigns during about eight hundred years. During the same period there have been one hundred and three popes.

² Recent statistics in New England show that clergymen attain a greater longevity than almost any other class.

³ Ex. vi. 16.

⁴ Matt. i.

⁵ Graf, *Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 247; Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, vol. iii. p. 71.

⁶ Ex. xxviii. 4-38.

for us to expect such a personage in the days of Moses after the Israelites had spoiled the Egyptians, or in the time of Solomon, when we have such pictures of luxury and magnificence. No! we err when we imagine that under the most magnificent of the monarchs of Israel such a high priest could have been found. But if we turn to the second temple, which was so much less glorious than the first that the old men wept when it was founded, we shall there discern the high priest as he is depicted to us in the middle books of the Pentateuch.¹ What, then, do we find in these books? The title high priest (*כהן הראש*) is applied to Amariah,² Jehoiada,³ Azariah,⁴ and to Aaron⁵ (*הכהן הגדול*), to Hilkiah⁶ and Eliashib.⁷ But we also find these titles applied to Jehoiada,⁸ Hilkiah,⁹ and to Seraiah,¹⁰ so that we have good reason for supposing that the priests had this title long before the exile. We look in vain for the description of the splendid garments in Chronicles, for a clear account of the special privileges and prerogatives of the high priest. The brief notices of their duties contained in

¹ Graf, *Die Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 43, says: "Von einem Hohepriester mit all der überragenden Herrlichkeit und Macht, wie er in der Zeit des zweiten Tempels zur Erscheinung kommt und wie er in der Gestalt Aaron's in der Priestergesetzgebung des Pentateuchs geschildert ist, weiss das Deut. nichts;" compare S. 46.

² 2 Chron. xix. 11.

³ *Ibid.* xxiv. 11.

⁴ 2 Chron. xxvi. 20, xxxi. 10.

⁵ Ezra vii. 5.

⁶ 2 Chron. xxxiv. 9.

⁷ Neh. iii. 1, 20.

⁸ 2 Kings xii. 11 (E. V. 10).

⁹ *Ibid.* xxii. 5, 9, xxiii. 4.

¹⁰ 2 Kings xxv. 18.

1 Chron. vi. 34 (E. V. 49), xxiii. 13, do not give us any such complete idea of the high priests as we obtain from the middle books of the Pentateuch. The solitary mention of Aaron in Ezra vii. 5, for which Graf must have been very thankful,¹ gives us no account of the glories assigned to the high priest.² As the critics have said that the description of the surpassing dignity and importance of the high priest which occurs in the middle books of the Pentateuch, is only found in the time of the second temple,³ and as there is but little difference in the mention of such a person between Kings and Chronicles, including Ezra and Nehemiah,⁴ we demand of the critics, as honest men, the proof of this assertion. We demand the history. We shall not accept any such wretched subterfuge as that the middle books of the Pentateuch imply that history, which would simply be reasoning in a circle. The critics must acknowledge that their boasted history does not exist except as a hypothesis.

It is confidently affirmed that in the priestly legislation of the middle books of the Pentateuch the priests are called sons of Aaron,⁵ and that the same phenome-

¹ *Die Geschichtl. Gesetzgebung*, S. 46.

² *Ibid.* S. 43.

³ *Ibid.* S. 46.

⁴ We do not yet venture any independent opinion as to the author of these two books. How little a great man needs a title, is illustrated in the fact that Aaron is never called high priest in the Pentateuch, but is simply designated either as Aaron, or as Aaron the priest.

⁵ Graf, *Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 46, says: "Die Priester werden in der Priestergesetzgebung Söhne Aaron's genannt, ein Name der

non appears in the Books of Chronicles, but never in any pre-exilic writings. This is not an exact statement of facts; and we have learned that in a scientific investigation everything depends on exactness. Priests are mentioned in the middle books of the Pentateuch 195 times, but in only seven places are they termed sons of Aaron,¹ or rather, strictly speaking, the sons of Aaron² are six times called priests, *בָּנֵי אַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֲנִים*. This is an important distinction, because Aaron and his sons are mentioned thirty-two times, and the sons of Aaron fourteen times, without being called priests, conclusively showing that in the middle books of the Pentateuch the term sons of Aaron is not at all appended to the word priests for a didactic purpose, as would be the case if they had been inserted in a programme. It is of course everywhere assumed that Aaron³ and his sons are priests, and *vice versa*, but this is a very different thing from a definite statement to that effect. In like manner, the Chronicler (including Ezra and Nehemiah) speaks of the priests 158 times. It must, however, be confessed that he defines the priests six times as sons of Aaron;⁴ in the other two cases he mentions the sons of Aaron as priests.⁵ Six times he speaks

in den anderen Schriften bis zum Exil nirgends vorkommt, auch Ezechiel nicht bekannt ist." Colenso, *Lects. on Pentateuch*, p. 199.

¹ Lev. i. 5, 8, 11, ii. 2, iii. 2, xxi. 1; Num. iii. 3.

² Ex. xxviii. 1; Lev. i. 7, iii. 5, vi. 7, vii. 10, viii. 13, 24, ix. 9, 12, 18, x. 1, 16, xvi. 1; Num. iii. 2.

³ Although Aaron's name occurs about 250 times, he is called the priest only sixteen times.

⁴ 2 Chron. xiii. 9, 10, xxvi. 18; xxxv. 14, twice; Neh. x. 39.

⁵ 2 Chron. xxix. 21, xxxi. 19.

of the sons of Aaron without any further designation. On the other hand, the statement that the priests are never called sons of Aaron in the pre-exilic writings¹ is a safe assertion. But since the priests the sons of Aaron are mentioned in that portion of Leviticus² which Graf, Kuenen, and Kayser³ claim was composed by Ezekiel, we have something which rebuts their theory that Ezekiel was only acquainted with the Aaronitic priesthood. They, however, will probably find it easy to assign at least the first verse, or the whole twenty-first chapter, if necessary, to the Elohist, as well as that passage in Joshua where we read of the sons of Aaron, the priests.⁴ Perhaps Graf's most unfortunate assertion is that in the Books of Chronicles nothing more is said of the Levitical priests,⁵ but only of priests and Levites.⁶ For a man whose book is over-

¹ Graf, *Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 46.

² Lev. xxi. 1.

³ *Die Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 75 f.; *Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 183 seq.; *Das Vorexilische Buch*, S. 64, and especially S. 178, where he compares Lev. xxi. 1-4 with Ezek. xliv. 25.

⁴ Josh. xxi. 19, comp. v. 4. See Graf, *Die Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 95, 96, who assigns the Book of Joshua to the Jehovah.

⁵ Graf, *Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 44, has implied something which, considering the consequences involved, is, to say the least, discreditable. He has given us to understand that in the Books of the Kings, where Levitical priests are mentioned, the Chronicler has everywhere placed priests and Levites. One who had not studied the matter would of course suppose that there were several places where the Levitical priests are mentioned. Not one such passage, however, exists in Kings. The Levites are mentioned only once, and that in 1 Kings viii. 4, where we read that the priests and Levites brought up the ark. As the Chronicler in the parallel passage, 2 Chron. v. 5, speaks of the Levitical priests as bringing it up, he furnishes a grim satire on this statement of Graf.

⁶ Graf, *ibid.* S. 46: "Diese im zweiten Tempel in Wirklichkeit

loaded with references, this is a strange statement. Either he has overlooked several passages,¹ or else he has taken an unscholarly advantage of readings which are not well established.² It is not probable, however, that he has examined the passages at all. We have already quoted them in other connections, and yet they deserve to be examined together here.

Assuredly if the Chronicler, who so carefully discriminates between the Aaronitic priests and the ordinary Levites, can speak of Levitical priests without inconsistency, would there be anything strange in the author of Deuteronomy using the same expression, if we suppose him to have been at least acquainted with the middle books of the Pentateuch? While a con-
bestehenden Verhältnisse [zwischen den Priester und Leviten] erscheinen eben so bei Esra und Nehemia und in der Chronik, welche das was zu ihrer Zeit bestand also von jeher in dieser Weise dagewesen, ansieht und darstellt; hier ist nicht mehr von Priester-Levit, sondern nur von Priestern und Leviten die Rede; die Leviten sind überall den Priestern, den *Söhnen Aaron's* untergeordnet."

The only books in the whole Bible in which we read of priests and Levites, are Kings (once) and Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah (thirty-three times).

¹ These are, 1 Chron. ix. 2; 2 Chron. v. 5, xxiii. 18, xxx. 27, Ezra x. 5; Neh. x. 29, 35 (E. V. 28, 34), xi. 20. That is, while there are seven passages in Deuteronomy (xvii. 9, 18, xviii. 1, xxiv. 8, xxvii. 9) and Joshua (iii. 3, viii. 33) where the priests Levites are mentioned, there are eight in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. Before the critics announce their intention of trying to secure a few firm and useful building stones from the dilapidated building which has been held up with rotten timbers (Graf, *Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. viii.), it would be well for them to see that their carefully chosen stones do not afterwards fall upon them.

² See Appendix iv.

nective is evidently implied in 1 Chron. ix. 2 : "Now the first inhabitants that dwelt in their possessions in their cities were the Israelites, the priests, the Levites, and the Nethinim ;" the case is entirely different in 2 Chron. v. 5 : "And they brought up the ark, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and all the holy vessels that were in the tabernacle ; these did the priests the Levites bring up."

Will the critics perhaps meet the difficulty by claiming that the reading (1 Kings viii. 4) with *and* between priests and Levites is original ? Surely, if the Chronicler were re-writing the history from the standpoint of the priestly books of the Pentateuch, this omission, according to the critics, ought to excite surprise. If any, however, are inclined to deny the force of this passage, they may find comfort in their theory by turning to 2 Chron. xxiii. 18 : "Also Jehoiada appointed the offices of the house of the Lord by the hand of the priests the Levites, whom David had distributed in the house of the Lord, to offer the burnt-offerings of the Lord, as it is written in the law of Moses, with rejoicing and singing according to David." Further, the Levitical priests are mentioned in 2 Chron. xxx. 27: "Then the priests the Levites arose and blessed the people."

Another unfortunate statement of Graf's is, that in every place in the Books of the Chronicles the Levites are subordinated to the Aaronitic priests.¹

¹ *Die Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 46: "Die Leviten sind überall den Priestern, den Söhnen Aaron's untergeordnet."

Now there are some passages which, if they stood alone, would leave it doubtful whether there was any essential difference between the priests and the Levites. Such is 2 Chron. xi. 13, 14: "And the priests and the Levites that were in all Israel resorted to him out of all their coasts. For the Levites left their suburbs and their possession, and came to Judah and Jerusalem: for Jeroboam and his sons had cast them off from executing the priest's office unto the Lord."

If we were to accept Graf's canon of interpretation, we must infer from the 14th verse that all Levites could be priests, and that the Chronicler has failed in this instance to distinguish between the Aaronitic priests and their dependants. Again, Hezekiah, in 2 Chron. xxix. 5, gathers the priests and Levites together, and says, "Hear me, ye Levites; sanctify now yourselves, and sanctify the house of the Lord God of your fathers."

Further, we read (2 Chron. xxxi. 2): "And Hezekiah appointed the courses of the priests and the Levites after their courses, every man according to his service, the priests and Levites for burnt-offerings and for peace-offerings, to minister, and to give thanks, and to praise in the gates of the tents of the Lord."

Take another verse, where the Levites, to be sure, are distinguished from the Aaronitic priests, and yet where any one who is inclined to find difficulties could easily do so. In 1 Chron. xxiii. 30 it is said of the Levites that it is their business "to stand every morning to thank and praise the Lord, and likewise at even; and to offer all burnt-sacrifices unto the Lord," etc.

It is evident that the word Levites is used in a general as well as a special sense in *Chronicles*. As the designation of the tribe, it includes the priests and their assistants, who are called Levites. This appears from the genealogy where Aaron and his sons are reckoned under the sons of Levi; from 1 Chron. xv. 11, 12, where Zadok and Abiathar, the priests, with some Levites in the narrower sense of the word, are called chief of the fathers of the Levites; and from the passages already quoted, where priests and Levites are classed under the name Levites.

There is not the slightest doubt in regard to the interpretation of the foregoing passages, because they are abundantly explained by the connection; but isolate them, and we should have the same phenomena as in *Deuteronomy*, and a similar opportunity for hair-splitting criticism.

We think that we have proved that the Chronicler is an important authority, not for his own age, as is claimed by the critics, but for the regal period.

Minor inaccuracies, which may have crept into the text, do not impair his credit in regard to the essential portions of his history. The severity of Graf's,¹ Kuenen's,² and Colenso's³ attacks on his credibility show how great an obstacle he is in the way of their theories. They have not been able to prove that he did not have good

¹ *Die Geschichtl. Bücher*, Cap. ii.; *Das Buch der Chronik als Geschichtsquelle*, S. 114-247.

² *The Religion of Israel*, vol. iii. pp. 70-81.

³ *Lectures on the Pentateuch and the Moabite Stone*, Lect. xxiv.: *The Fictions of the Chronicler*, pp. 333-346.

authority for his statements in regard to the priests and Levites.

They cannot find the high priest of the middle books of the Pentateuch in his writings, nor claim that the Aaronitic priesthood is taught in them. Their claim that he always carefully distinguishes between the priests and the Levites completely breaks down.

If Colenso can scarcely contain himself while he writes of the fictions of the Chronicler, who has changed the face of history and Christian doctrine for 2000 years,¹ what shall we say of this man, who sets himself up as the medium of the latest phase of critical opinion for his benighted countrymen,² and as a great reformer!

¹ Colenso, *ibid.* p. 346, says: "When, however, we consider that for 2000 years the whole course of Jewish history has been thrown into confusion mainly by the acts of these writers, and that Christianity itself owes much of its past and present corruptions and superstitions—such as the idea of the priestly office and the popular notion of the atonement, based upon the supposed divine origin of the sacrificial laws in the Pentateuch—to the existence of these priestly and Levitical fictions, it is not easy to speak lightly of a fraud which has had such enormous and far-reaching evil consequences; while we find here another warning—unhappily by no means unneeded in the present age—that 'lies spoken in the name of the Lord' (Zech. xiii. 3), however well meant, can never work out the good of man or the righteousness of God."

² *Idem*, Preface, vi. After speaking of some admissions made in the New Bible Commentary "by bishops and other clergy of the Anglican Church," he says: "Under the above circumstances, the time seems to have arrived for preparing a work 'in which the latest information may be made accessible to men of ordinary culture,' by one who has studied the question from a different point of view from that of these commentators, and has arrived at very different conclusions."

He has handled the subject with great coarseness ; and so far from giving the opinion of the best critics of his school¹ in regard to the responsibility of the Chronicler for alleged misrepresentations, has in this particular simply followed the antiquated Gramberg,² unless this is a case where great minds think alike.

¹ Graf, *Geschichtl. Bücher*, S. 121 f., remarks : “ It is wrong when Gramberg accuses him of forgery because he has added to the accounts in the Books of Samuel and Kings so many things which we must recognise as contradictory or unhistorical. . . . Does one consider Livy a forger, because, without the examination of documents which he might have had at command, he arranged and coloured events, after the popular legend, according to the end which he had in view ? ”

Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, vol. iii. p. 75 : “ It appears, then, that the Israelitish priesthood, to maintain its authority and heighten its prestige, employed the same means which priests used elsewhere in the old world, and of which the bishops of Rome made use in the middle ages. This fact must be recognised in its full scope and significance. But while we do this, we wish to bear in mind that such ‘ pious frauds ’ were considered lawful, and that they must be imputed not to a single person—e.g. the Chronicler—but to the whole priestly order. The individual cannot, or can hardly be held responsible for such representations, which for the chief part he received from others, and at most worked out and trimmed a little more.”

² Colenso, *Lectures on the Pentateuch*, p. 345 : “ The time is past for glossing over such conduct as the Chronicler’s with fair words, and ascribing to him only error or exaggeration, but no intentional departure from the truth. He has set himself down to reconstruct the history of his people as known to himself in the older records, and he has done this in the interest of the clerical body, to which, in all probability, he belonged.” Compare Gramberg, *Die Chronik*, Halle 1823, S. 224 : “ The systematic adulteration of the history, which extends throughout the book, and always remains similar in its main features, shows that it only comes from one author.”

CHAPTER VIII.

THE PROPHETS AND THE PRIESTS.

Summary: The so-called antagonism of the prophets to the law and the priesthood—The prophets' occupation is gone after the exile—Joel manifests no antagonism to the priests—Amos' collision with a spurious high priest—The reason for Hosea's antagonism to the priests—His use of the word *Thorah*—Is Isaiah a collection of prophecies?—The priests the Levites—Zephaniah—Jeremiah—Explanation of vii. 22, 23—Is xxiii. seq. spurious?—Haggai and Zechariah—Malachi—Does not allude to the new epoch—What does he mean by *Thorah*?—Why does he not mention the sons of Aaron?—The covenant with Levi—Traces of decay in Malachi—His teaching—General characteristics of the prophecies.

SOME of the recent critics claim to have found in the prophets undeniable evidence of their antagonism to the Mosaic age of the legislation of the Pentateuch,¹ and the proof that the hierarchy only obtained full power with the extinction of prophecy.²

¹ Duhm, *Die Theologie der Propheten*, Bonn 1875, S. 12: “The pre-exilic prophets are conscious of their sharp antagonism to the ceremonial observances, and indeed not merely against their exaggeration and external observance.” Compare Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, vol. i. p. 189.

² This claim is not put forward in so many words. But one derives this impression from Kuenen's and Duhm's general teaching, which is, (1) that the religion of Israel began with the prophets (Duhm); (2) that there is an antagonism between the prophets and the priests (Kuenen, vol. i. p. 189), whom they often attack (Duhm, S. 12); (3) that the Mosaic law was a compromise made

They assert that the Israelitish religion first begins with the prophets,¹ and that in Ezra's time, as soon as the law enters into force, the prophetic spirit is almost extinguished.² Of course, according to this supposition, we ought to expect to find, as it seems to us, the priests in the background in the older prophets, and gradually passing through the transition state of Levitical priests, until they emerge as sons and successors of Aaron, who are sharply distinguished from the Levites. This should be the representation in the prophetical books, if the views of the latest critics are correct. But this course of development does not appear in the prophets; and the modern view is impeded by some rough obstacles before it reaches that golden post-exilic period to which, according to the critics, we owe so much of the Mosaic legislation.

by the priests between the popular religion and the Jahvism of the prophets (Kuenen, vol. ii. p. 255); and (4) as soon as this priestly law enters into force, the prophetic spirit ceases.

¹ Duhm, S. 15: "Must one not come to the conclusion, unless the entire religion is to be derived exclusively from the activity of God, that the Israelitish religion first begins with the times of the prophets?"

² *Ibid.* S. 10: "Is an organic growth of the prophetic from the legal period of Moses conceivable? . . . An affirmative answer is to no slight degree rendered difficult by the fact that, as soon in Ezra's time as the law enters into force, the prophetic spirit is as good as extinguished."

Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 240: "The prophet is the man of inspiration and enthusiasm; his sphere can in no way be measured out and circumscribed; he is driven to act and speak by what he sees; the anxious calculation of the consequences of his actions or words is unknown to him. Thus there is no room for him in such a society as Ezra and Nehemiah tried to establish."

According to the negative school, the Mosaic spirit which then arose, and which is exhibited in the priestly portions of the Pentateuch, was fatal to prophecy.

What, then, was the chief characteristic of the prophetic teachings? Do we find them anywhere setting forth the elements of religion, as though the people had never before received religious instruction?

Surely we ought to expect this if the Israelitish religion originated with them. So far, however, as we have an opportunity of judging of their work, they seem to be interpreters of the divine will as, without contradiction, already known and acknowledged.

They presuppose the people's acquaintance with a moral law, by which we do not merely mean the law of conscience. They make scathing denunciations of all kinds of wickedness, especially of the people's idolatry. Israel is sometimes compared to an unfaithful wife,¹ whose external demonstrations of affection are loathsome because her heart has been given to another. The extinction of the prophetic spirit after the exile was not due to the predominance of the priesthood. Their occupation was gone. The evils with which they had contended had disappeared. Their denunciations of idolatry after the exile would have been as ill-timed as the appearance of Abolitionists in America after the extinction of slavery. The prophets passed away, as all reformers do, with the disappearance of the great contrasts which characterized the pre-exilic periods, such as the contrast

¹ Jer. iii. 6-11; Ezek. xvi. 8-48, xxiii.; Hos. i. 2.

between the wicked kings and the idea of the Davidic kingdom, and that between Jehovah and the worship of false gods.

Let us now examine the prophets in the order given by De Wette,¹ to see whether we find this antagonism of the prophets to the Mosaic law and to the priesthood. First, then, let us examine Joel, 870 B.C. This prophet, who is assigned by all the best authorities² to a high date, does not confirm the modern hypothesis, and therefore is put by Duhm in the post-exilic age, but only for this reason, because the pre-exilic age of Joel could not agree with his imaginary construction of development of prophecy and of the Israelitish religion. Joel, however, so far from manifesting any antagonism to the priests, makes such frequent mention of them, that one might almost think that he himself was a priest. We have utterly failed to discover anything in his writings contrary to the Mosaic law. The condition of the priests when this prophet wrote must have been flourishing. The general character of the prophet's teachings is indicated by an exhortation to the people to rend their hearts, and not their garments.

Amos, 790 B.C., is supposed to furnish confirmatory evidence of the modern views. We must admit that

¹ We follow De Wette's order, so that we may escape the charge of in any sense adapting the dates to apologetic purposes.

² Kuenen, 878-858 B.C.; Bleek, 800 B.C.; Keil, 877-847 B.C. Compare Delitzsch in the *Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche*, Leipzig 1851, S. 306 ff.

he manifests antagonism towards a certain priest, the only one who is mentioned in the book. This, however, proves absolutely nothing. Amos prophesied, not in Judah, but in Israel, under Jeroboam II. He therefore came into collision, not with an Aaronitic priest, but with the spurious high priest of Bethel, where Jeroboam I. had set up a golden calf, and ordained priests from the lowest of the people who were not of the sons of Levi. Certainly no real antagonism is apparent between Amos and the Mosaic law. While it might be difficult to prove that Amos directly referred to the law given by Moses, he says: “For three transgressions of Judah, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they have despised the law of the Lord, and have not kept His commandments” (comp. Lev. xxvi. 15: “And if ye shall despise my statutes, or if your soul abhor my judgments, so that ye will not do all my commandments,” etc.). His writings, however, betray a knowledge of at least some portions of the Pentateuch. The prophet’s stern condemnation of the people’s religious observances did not arise from his antagonism to the law, but from their breach of it. With biting sarcasm he bids them “come to Beth-el and transgress; at Gilgal multiply transgression; and bring your sacrifices every morning and your tithes once in three days: and offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving with leaven, and proclaim and publish the free offerings,” etc.

According to Kuenen and Duhm, Amos represents

that the children of Israel, during their sojourn in the wilderness, did not offer sacrifices. They find this in v. 25: "Have ye offered unto me sacrifices and offerings forty years, O house of Israel?" If this passage stood alone, it would imply a negative answer. The connection, however, shows that this is not the case. The prophet represents the Lord as saying, ver. 21: "I hate, I despise your feast days" (compare Prov. xxi. 27: "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord; how much more when he bringeth it with a wicked mind?"), "and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies" (Lev. xxvi. 31b: "And will not smell the savour of your sweet odours"). Ver. 22: "Though ye offer me burnt-offerings and your meat-offering, I will not accept them; neither will I regard the peace-offerings of your fat beasts."

These passages do not by any means show that sacrifices were unacceptable to God when coming from true worshippers. The cause of their being an abomination to Him appears from the exhortation, ver. 24: "But let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream." Then comes the question which is supposed to indicate that the Israelites did not offer sacrifices in the desert. The interpretation of the critics does violence to the whole connection. The question implies that, although they offered sacrifices and offerings to God during their journeyings in the wilderness, these were worse than none, for He adds, ver. 26: "Ye have borne the tabernacle of your Moloch and Chiun, your images, the star of your god, which ye made to

yourselves.”¹ That Israel, which had served the gods of Egypt (Josh. xxiv. 15), was inclined to idolatry in the wilderness, is apparent from the worship of the golden calf, Lev. xvii. 7: “And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils, after whom they have gone a whoring;” and from Ezek. xx. 23, 24: “I lifted up mine hand unto them also in the wilderness, that I would scatter them among the heathen, and disperse them through the countries; because they had not executed my judgments, but had despised my statutes, and had polluted my sabbaths, and their eyes were after their fathers’ idols.”

Hence it is that the Lord reminds Israel that their present sacrifices, which they offer while their hearts are far from Him, are as detestable as those which their fathers offered in the wilderness when they were serving idols. The critics of the negative school can only hold this passage when they take it out of its connection, and ignore those passages which we have quoted. Only the misinterpretation of Amos can make him ignorant of the Mosaic law. His preaching is in this case directed, like that of his fellow-prophets, against hypocrisy.

Duhm discreetly admits that Hosea, 785 B.C., does

¹ The true connection of this passage with the preceding verse seems to us to be lost when it is understood of the Babylonian and Syrian idolatry of the time of the prophet (see Count Baudissin, *Jahve et Moloch*, Lipsiae 1874, p. 48). He simply applies the names of contemporary idols, as well known to those whom he was addressing, to the idolatry of the wilderness.

not reject sacrifices as such;¹ that he especially reproaches the people for their ignorance of God; and that the Decalogue seems to direct him in his enumeration of individual sins.² Hosea's standpoint is in the main similar to that of other prophets. He reports God as saying,³ "For I desired mercy and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings." All will admit that this is no condemnation of sacrifices. His antagonism to the priests of his time is due to their character, although even the non-Levitical origin of the Israelitish priesthood and their illegal worship furnish a sufficient reason for his being opposed to them. He charges them with their lack of knowledge,⁴ and with being murderers and robbers.⁵ Hence it is evident that he neither regards with disapproval nor aversion the office of the priests, but simply its most unworthy incumbents in Israel. Instead of manifesting a want of harmony with the law, he furnishes conclusive evidence to us that he was acquainted with it; and by this we do not merely mean the Decalogue, but at least the substance of our Pentateuch. We do not by any means intimate that we can afford proof which will satisfy those who hold negative views, but we are persuaded that no one can prove, when Hosea says,⁶ "Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me; seeing thou hast forgotten the law (*Thorah*) of thy God, I

¹ *Theologie der Propheten*, S. 132.

² *Ibid.* S. 131.

³ Hos. vi. 6.

⁴ Hos. iv. 6.

⁵ Hos. vi. 9.

⁶ *Ibid.* iv. 6.

will also forget thy children," that he refers to his own Thorah, or that of any of his immediate predecessors.¹ The many correspondences between Hosea and the different portions of the Pentateuch, taken in connection with his allusion to the Thorah as that which the priests should keep, while not proving that he knew essentially our Pentateuch, look very strongly that way.²

The greatest of all the prophets, Isaiah, 759 B.C., neither manifests an antagonism to the Mosaic law nor to the priesthood. We must confess that we are not able to see in this book a collection of prophecies³ rather than the work of a single author. We could as easily believe that the Sistine Madonna was the production of several different artists, or that *Faust* was composed by Goethe and a Deutero-Goethe, as that these prophecies were not written by Isaiah. Our argument, however, would not be essentially affected if we were to accept the dates assigned by many critics to the different portions. The animus of the prophecies in either case is essentially the same. God only detests the sacrifices of Israel when they are brought with false hearts. He only hides His face from them when their hands are full of blood. That God sanctions sacrifices, appears from this prophecy:⁴ "And the Lord shall be known to Egypt, and the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day, and shall do sacrifice and oblation; yea, they shall vow a vow

¹ See Appendix ii.

³ See Appendix iii.

² *Ibid.* ii.

⁴ Isa. xix. 21.

unto the Lord and perform it." We infer from viii. 2 that Isaiah had confidence in Uriah, who was probably the same as Urijah, a high priest under Ahaz.¹ His condemnation of the priests and the prophets is on account of their intemperance.² Under Hezekiah, the elders of the priests are sent to Isaiah,³ which certainly would not have been the case if the king had known that he was opposed to the priesthood on principle. The most interesting passage, however, is in the last chapter of the book:⁴ "And I will also take of them for priests *and* Levites, saith the Lord." The connective "and" between priests and Levites does not occur in the received Hebrew text. It is, however, found in the Septuagint, the Chaldee version, and in over seventy Hebrew manuscripts, some of which are the very oldest and best.⁵ If we may not venture to change the reading, there is no question that the Levitical priests in the Deuteronomic sense are not intended here, but two distinct classes, namely, priests and Levites. Here, then, in a prophecy which, according to De Wette,⁶ belongs to the exile, or, according to our view, to the time of Hezekiah or Manasseh, priests and Levites are mentioned by the prophet as standing *de jure* for the present and the future.

Micah, 725 B.C., the contemporary of Isaiah, testifies to the cruelty of the princes, the falsehood of the prophets, and the greed of the priests.⁷

¹ 2 Kings xvi. 10.

² Isa. xxviii. 7.

³ Isa. xxxvii. 2.

⁴ Isa. lxvi. 21.

⁵ See Appendix iv.

⁶ *Einleitung*, S. 411 ff.

⁷ Mic. iii.

Like the other prophets, he rejects mere formalism, when he says:¹ “Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God ? Shall I come before Him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old ? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil ? Shall I give my first-born for my transgressions, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul ? He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good ; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God ?” These last words are almost the echo of Deut. x. 12 : “And now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but to fear the Lord thy God, to walk in all His ways ?” etc. The mention of calves a year old presupposes the existence of the regulation found in Lev. ix. 3 ; while we naturally connect the allusion to the use of oil in sacrifice with Lev. ii. 5, 6.

Zephaniah, 640 B.C., paints the character of the leading personages in Judah in anything but flattering colours:² “Her princes within her are roaring lions, her judges are evening wolves ; they gnaw not the bones until the morrow. Her prophets are light and treacherous persons ; her priests have polluted the sanctuary, they have done violence to the law.” It is evident that there is here no more antagonism to the priests than to the other classes named.

Jeremiah, 626 B.C. (Graf), often mentions the priests in his writings. But he wages no special

¹ Mic. vi. 6-8.

² Zeph. iii. 3, 4.

polemic against them. He simply considers them in the same category as other corrupt members of society:¹ “As the thief is ashamed when he is found, so is the house of Israel ashamed; they, their kings, their princes and their priests, and their prophets.” “From the prophet even unto the priest, every one dealeth falsely.”² In prophesying the return from the captivity, he expresses himself in terms which show that he is not opposed to the priesthood as an institution:³ “And I will satiate the soul of the priests with fatness, and my people shall be satisfied with goodness.” It is claimed, however, that, “first Jeremiah is moved by the scribes, who appear in his time, to the explanation that Jahveh in the time of Moses had given no law with reference to offering.”⁴ The passage to which allusion is made has occasioned more difficulty than is necessary. Jeremiah proclaims the uselessness of sacrifices in the same spirit as the other prophets: “Hear, O earth; behold, I will bring evil upon this people, even the fruit of their thoughts, because they have not hearkened unto my words nor to my law, but rejected it.”⁵ “To what purpose cometh there to me incense from Sheba, and the sweet cane from a far country? Your burnt-offerings are not acceptable, nor your sacrifices sweet unto me.”⁶ That Jeremiah, however, is not opposed to sacrifices, when offered by the obedient, is evident:⁷ “And it shall come to pass, if ye diligently

¹ Jer. ii. 26; comp. iv. 9, xxxii. 32.

² Jer. vi. 13.

³ Jer. xxxi. 14.

⁴ Duhm, *Die Theologie der Propheten*, S. 12¹.

⁵ Jer. vi. 19.

⁶ Jer. vi. 19, 20.

⁷ Jer. xvii. 24–26.

hearken unto me, saith the Lord. . . . Then shall there enter into the gates of the city kings and princes, sitting upon the throne of David. . . . And they shall come from the cities of Judah, . . . bringing burnt-offerings and sacrifices, and meat-offerings, and incense, and bringing sacrifices of praise unto the house of the Lord." The prophet clearly teaches that all these observances are not acceptable unless the heart is right. Now, when we consider this, it seems to us that we can readily interpret the true meaning of the passage in question:¹ "For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices. But this thing I commanded them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people." Maimonides² refers these words of Jeremiah to the first beginning of the legislation at Marah, where the Lord said to Israel, "If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God."³ "There He made for them a statute and an ordinance."⁴ Graf⁵ however, has correctly observed that this interpretation, which emphasizes the time, is not legitimate, since the prophet elsewhere uses the expression, "In the day that ye came out of Egypt," of the covenant which was made with the Lord at Sinai.⁶

¹ Jer. vii. 22, 23.

² Munk, *Le Guide des Égarés*, Paris 1866, t. iii. chap. xxxii. p. 259.

³ Ex. xv. 26.

⁴ Ex. xv. 25.

⁵ *Der Prophet Jeremiah*, Leipzig 1862, S. 121 ff.

⁶ Jer. xi. 4, xxxi. 32, xxxiv. 13. The possibility that the

The simplest, and, as it seems to us, the only correct explanation, is that which has been given by William Lowth:¹ “It is a way of speaking usual in Scripture, to express the preference that is due to one thing above another, in terms which express the rejecting of that which is less worthy; and thus I conceive we are to understand the text here in correspondence with the parallel place of Hos. vi. 6, ‘I will have mercy and not sacrifice,—the words in both places implying that God always laid a greater stress upon sincere obedience than on external observances,² and designed the latter as so many mounds and fences to guard and preserve the former.” Certainly, when we consider that obedience was the main thing which God desired of

prophet refers to the incident related in Ex. xv. 25 is not really disproved by the above quotations, since this may have been the time to which allusion is made. The excellent Rabbinical scholar J. H. R. Biesenthal, D.D., adopts Maimonides’ interpretation.

¹ *A Commentary upon the Prophecy and Lamentations of Jeremiah*, London 1718, p. 77.

² The same author, on Jer. vi. 20, refers to Plato’s *Second Alcibiades*, 148 E, showing that the Greek philosopher recognised that the mere offering of sacrifices could not be pleasing to Deity: “The Athenians, after suffering many defeats, sent a messenger to Jupiter Ammon to inquire why they, who had erected so many temples to the gods, and honoured them with so many oblations and sacrifices, should be less successful than the Lacedemonians, who were far inferior to them in these particulars. The oracle replied, ‘I am better pleased with the prayer of the Lacedemonians, than with all the oblations of the Greeks.’ Now the prayer which they used was a brief petition, in which they begged the gods to give them all good things so long as they continued virtuous.”

His people, and that the formal promulgation of the ten commandments was really first in point of time and importance, we need find no stumbling-block in the declaration that God did not command them,¹ when He brought them out of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices, but said, Obey my voice.²

The objections³ which have recently been raised against the genuineness of xxxiii. 17 seq., as contradictory to vii. 21, fall to the ground as soon as we accept the above explanation, which is perfectly con-

¹ Compare the expression for a less degree of love, Gen. xxix. 31; Deut. xxi. 15; Luke xiv. 26.

² Rashi's comment on this passage seems especially worthy of notice: "The beginning of my agreement was nothing else than, If ye will certainly obey my voice and keep my covenant, ye shall be my peculiar people." Rashi refers to Ex. xix. 5: "Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure to me above all people."

³ Guthe, *De Fæderis Notione Jeremiana*, Lipsiae 1877, p. 23: "We read something contrary to this opinion, xxxiii. 17 seq., where the prophet emphatically asserts that the Levitical priests, as well as the house of David, will flourish through a great multitude of descendants, on account of the covenant through which they are united with Jahveh. But since this covenant with the tribe of Levi as well as with the house of David could not exist unless that with the entire people had preceded it, it is to be considered a part of it, and the prophet would with these words have included the priests in the covenant; and since it was their duty to discharge the sacred offices, it would contradict our interpretation of vii. 21 seq. But we think that Jeremiah neither wrote nor spoke this prophecy. For, since the Septuaginta omit the words, xxxiii. 14-26, we conclude that they did not find them in their copy." Graf, however, in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon*, B. iii. S. 208, has shown that such omissions do not presuppose a different text from ours, but rather great independence on the part of the translator. Compare also Graf's Commentary *in loco*.

sistent with prophetic modes of thought, and with the attitude of the prophet towards sacrifices. Jeremiah prophesies that in the ideal state Levitical priests will not be wanting for the offering of sacrifices. It is not necessary for us to reaffirm that this passage does not prove that all Levites may be priests. It simply proves that here as well as in Ezekiel,¹ where a large body of the Levites are excluded from the priesthood, the priests are termed Levitical. This phraseology is simply the natural repetition of that which was introduced by the great lawgiver in his final address to the tribes, but is in no respect inconsistent with a requirement that the priests should be descendants of Aaron, to which family Jeremiah himself undoubtedly belonged.² In the last chapter of his prophecy he mentions the chief priest Seraiah,³ whose name occurs in the Books of Kings.⁴

A comparison of Jeremiah's prophecies clearly shows that he is neither opposed to the law nor to the priests in themselves, but to hypocrisy, both in those who bring their sacrifices and in those who minister at the altar. In vision he contemplates a time when acceptable sacrifices shall be offered by a holy people and by worthy priests.⁵

¹ Ezek. xlivi. 19, xliv. 15.

² In Jer. i. 1 we read: "The words of Jeremiah, son of Hilkiah, of the priests that were in Anathoth, in the land of Benjamin." From Josh. xxi. 18 we learn that Anathoth, out of the tribe of Benjamin, belonged to the children of Aaron. Jeremiah's redemption of the field in Anathoth evidently rests upon the laws which are contained in Lev. xxv. 24-32.

³ Jer. lii. 24.

⁴ 2 Kings xxv. 18.

⁵ Jer. xvii. 26, xxxi. 14.

The post-exilic contemporaries, Haggai and Zechariah, prophesied in the second year of Darius Hystaspis, 520 B.C. The former mentions Joshua the high priest. He represents the Lord as saying to him, "Ask now the priests concerning the law"¹ (Lev. x. 10, 11: "And that ye may put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean; and that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses"). In the above passage, the priests are simply mentioned without praise or blame. It may be that the critics of the negative school will consider this an evidence of the increasing influence of the priesthood.

We have no objections to their holding this opinion. We will reserve ours until we reach the prophet who appeared after the time when it is claimed that Ezra published the priestly law. Zechariah manifests no antipathy to the law or to the priests. He mentions Joshua the high priest as wearing a fair mitre,² and as being clad with garments. This description of the dress of the high priest may be thought to bear a suspicious resemblance to that given in the priestly legislation. This reference, however, and that to the golden candlestick, seem to indicate the priority of that which is more fully described in the middle books of the Pentateuch.³ Zechariah reproves the people and the priests, in the same strain as his predecessors, for their formality in fasting, and exhorts them to justice and mercy. He

¹ Hag. ii. 11. ² Zech. iii. 5, vi. 11. ³ Ex. xxviii. 4.

says that the family of the house of Levi shall mourn.¹ But shall we conclude that the lineage of Aaron was not yet acknowledged, because he does not especially name it? Zechariah also denounces the false prophets who have brought disgrace upon the very name. There is in this prophet no evidence of his antagonism to the priests.

We pass now to the last, and, for our discussion, the most interesting of the prophets, Malachi, 430 B.C. Kuenen very correctly considers him a younger contemporary of Ezra and Nehemiah.² The time of his prophecy falls, according to Kuenen, eleven years after that of the final redaction of the Thorah.³ Certainly we might reasonably expect that this latest phase of the law, its final triumph,⁴ would either arouse the opposition of the prophet or secure his support. Cer-

¹ Zech. xii. 13. As this is the only passage which bears upon the priests in xi.-xiv., it does not seem necessary to enter into any discussion of the authenticity of this portion.

² Kuenen, *Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek*, ii. z. 400-1: "The opinion that he was a younger contemporary of Ezra and Nehemiah, and prophesied during the second residence of the latter in Judea, from 433 B.C., is supported by a comparison of Mal. ii. 10-16, iii. 8-10, with Neh. xiii. 23 seq.; 10-12, 31, is not refuted by i. 8, and appears preferable to the opinion of Hitzig and others, who place the prophet before Nehemiah."

³ Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 233: "Thus we are inclined to regard the years which elapsed between 458 and 444 B.C. as the period of finishing off and—at all events provisional—final redaction of the Thorah."

⁴ *Ibid.* 248: "It would be wrong to regard the reformation as the work or as a victory of the priesthood. It took place in their spirit and to their interest; it even was affected *through the priests*. . . . Still it cannot be looked upon as a triumph or exaltation of the priesthood, as such. It was not the priesthood that was raised to supreme power, *but the Law*."

tainly a prophecy uttered at such a time should not fail to afford unmistakeable traces of the great change which must have been introduced on the publication of the new code.¹ Above all, if the priests had recently begun to trace their descent from Aaron, and there was an effort to distinguish them from the ordinary Levites, we ought to find it in this prophecy. Is it not remarkable that we do not find the slightest allusion to the great epoch which Ezra had so recently ushered in, or to the new codification of the law?² There is no

¹ *The Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 218: "It is nothing less than a revolution which we are about to describe. The labours of Ezra and Nehemiah form a turning-point in the history of Israel's religion." . . . P. 219: "Ezra and Nehemiah appear acting in concert; the event related there, in Neh. viii.-x., took place in the seventh month, but the year in which it fell is not given. Thus we must place it between 444 B.C., the year after Nehemiah's arrival, and 433 B.C., when he went back to Persia, and presumably at the beginning of this period." . . . P. 226: "On the first day of the seventh month, a general gathering of the people was held at Jerusalem. . . . A lofty and capacious platform had been erected. Upon this Ezra took his stand, with fourteen priests, seven on his right hand and seven on his left. At the request of the people, he had brought—from the temple—the 'book of the law of Moses, which Jahveh had commanded to Israel.'" . . . P. 230: "The book of the law which is now proclaimed also includes the *priestly laws*. So their promulgation naturally becomes the chief thing. . . . We do not hesitate to look upon the introduction of those laws, with the historian, as the real task of Ezra and Nehemiah."

² *Ibid.* p. 241: "The prophet makes room for the scribe, or rather becomes himself the scribe, as it is not incorrectly believed can be shown, e.g. in Malachi's prophecies." . . . P. 248: "He, therefore, who most identified himself with the law could count upon permanently holding the first rank; in other words, *the Scribe* stood higher in Ezra's state than the priest."

evidence that he refers to the latest redaction of the Pentateuch. He charges the people to remember the law (Thorah) of Moses, which God commanded in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and the judgments.¹ Now, when we follow the usual course of argument, we have no more reason for thinking that he means the whole Pentateuch than in many other passages in which the Thorah of Moses is mentioned. Indeed, when the prophet speaks of Horeb as the place where the law is revealed, he uses the same designation which occurs in the Book of Deuteronomy.²

Moreover, in reproving the priests for their unjust use of the Thorah, which is said by the critics to mean the priestly teaching, he does not bind them to the new written law,³ but he renews the old privilege which was given to the ancestors of the present priests, in that he says:⁴ “For the priest’s lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth.” Besides, Malachi makes no exclusive use of the priestly legislation. He speaks of the tithes being kept in the storehouse,⁵ to which no allusion is made in the Pentateuch, which Ezra had not thought fit to embody in the final redaction, although this was the custom before and after the

¹ Mal. iv. 4.

² Deut. iv. 10: “Specially the day that thou stoodest before the Lord thy God in Horeb.”

³ Comp. Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 248: “The priestly Thorah, which in Josiah’s days still existed only as oral tradition, and the maintenance of which was at that time dependent upon the zeal and interest of the priests, was now committed to writing, and thus much better guaranteed than before.”

⁴ Mal. ii. 7.

⁵ Mal. iii. 10.

exile.¹ Strangest of all, the prophet makes no mention of the sons of Aaron, and does not distinguish the priests from the Levites. If we must infer from the language of the Deuteronomist that any Levite by virtue of his birth might become a priest, we surely must draw the same inference from Mal. ii. 4-8 : “And ye shall know that I have sent this commandment unto you, that my covenant might be with Levi, saith the Lord of hosts. My covenant was with him of life and peace ; and I gave them to him for the fear wherewith he feared me, and was afraid before my name. The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips : he walked with me in peace and equity, and did turn many from iniquity. . . . But ye are departed out of the way ; ye have caused many to stumble at the law ; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord of hosts.” In these verses God speaks of His covenant with Levi, and evidently considers the priests his descendants. According to our theory, we see no difficulty in this ; for the priests, who in a special sense are sons of Aaron, are, more generally speaking, descendants of Levi. But according to the theory of the critics, this seems inexplicable, and cannot be accounted for by assuming that the prophet was unaccustomed to the new phraseology.²

¹ 2 Chron. xxxi. 11 ; Neh. x. 38, xiii. 12. According to some of the critics, the statement in 2 Chronicles is simply a priestly fiction, which was intended to excite the benevolent emulation of the people.

² Colenso, *Lectures on the Pentateuch*, p. 337, naïvely remarks : “Nehemiah, however, in his genuine memoir (vii. 1a, 2-5a, xiii. 4-5a, 6-8, 9b, 14-21, 22b-28, 31b [truly a fine specimen of

Let us now examine Malachi in his relation to the other prophets. He is said to manifest evident traces of the dying out of prophecy in manner and matter,¹ and more of the characteristics of the scribes, who take the place of the prophets.² It seems to us that this theory of Malachi's inferiority to the other prophets is not fully justified. His style is more colloquial and controversial. This may have been partially due to the age as well as the man. The great themes of a future captivity and of the restoration of the people were no longer available. There was no more need of the purification of the new congregation from abuses, and the vindication of the Scriptures, than of any new prophetic revelation. Hence it seems to us that, when Kuenen supposes that a Judaistic tendency stifled prophecy,³ and finds an evidence of this in the inferior utterances of Malachi, he offers a view which may or may not be true, and adduces an example which, if viewed with purely critical eyes, adds but little, if any, weight to his argument.

critical analysis !]), speaks of the Levites, and also of the Nethinim, as building their portion of the wall apart from the priests. In his time, therefore, the distinction, it seems, was recognised; though Malachi, his contemporary, still speaks of the priests by the older designation, 'the sons of Levi,' instead of using the newly-coined phrase, 'the sons of Aaron.'"

¹ De Wette, *Einleitung*, S. 485: "In Vortrag, Rythmus und Bildern eifert Maleachi nicht ganz unglücklich den alten Propheten nach; doch fühlt man immer den matten, erstorbenen Geist, der wohl versuchen, aher nicht vollenden kann, und seines Stoffes nicht mächtig ist."

² See remark, p. 139, n. 2.

³ *Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. pp. 240-9.

When we consider the teaching of Malachi, we find in it substantially the same elements as in that of the other prophets. He attacks the priests,¹ not from any personal animosity to them, but on account of their corrupt practices. They offer polluted bread on the altar of the Lord,² the blind, the lame, the sick,³ and the torn.⁴ Therefore, “I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts; neither will I accept an offering at your hand.”⁵ That the prophet does not merely regard these external observances as an end, but expects a radical reformation, is apparent from his teaching: “Behold, I will send my messenger, and He shall prepare the way before me; . . . behold, He shall come, saith the Lord of hosts. But who may abide the day of His coming? and who shall stand when He appeareth? for He is like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap: and He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and He shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old, and as in ancient years.”⁶ From this it appears (1) that Malachi, like the other prophets, represents that purity of heart is essential in order that these offerings may be acceptable; and (2) that he recognised a time before the apostasy of Israel when the offerings were brought with pure hearts.

¹ Mal. i. 6.² Mal. i. 7.³ Mal. i. 8.⁴ Mal. i. 13.⁵ Mal. i. 10b.⁶ Mal. iii. 1-4.

It seems to us that an impartial examination of the prophets must signally fail to afford evidence either of an antagonism of the prophets to the law or to the priests. The same characteristics are to be found more or less distinctly in all the prophets from Joel to Malachi. There is in them an unsparing denunciation of all forms of corruption, and of formal services which are rendered to Jehovah while the heart is far from Him. There is the same assurance that, when the worshippers come with true sincerity, their offerings and sacrifices will be acceptable. Wicked ministers, whether of the word (prophets) or of the sanctuary (priests), do not escape the prophet's denunciations. Their eyes are fixed on an ideal, a blessed state, where God reigns supreme, where injustice and violence are not found, where the true, the beautiful, and the good may be realized. Their starting-point is in the city so dear to every Jewish heart. But they, although perhaps merely looking for the rebuilding and purification of the same, were really expecting, although they knew it not, like the aged saint on the isle of Patmos, a new and glorified Jerusalem coming down from heaven like a bride adorned for her husband. Neither the law nor the priesthood were banished from the prophet's thoughts of the future. They were rather to be purified and renovated, until the great High Priest, having offered Himself a sacrifice for sin, and honoured the law, should usher in the dispensation of grace and truth.

CHAPTER IX.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF DEUTERONOMY AND THE MIDDLE BOOKS OF THE PENTATEUCH.

Summary : Brief review—The Deuteronomic legislation and that of the middle books of the Pentateuch—Who was the author of Deuteronomy ?—Internal evidence—Moses' and Hilkiah's claims compared—Moses speaks from experience—Generalizations—“Moses wrote this law”—Ideas of literary propriety—Critical difficulties—Was Ezra the author of the middle books of the Pentateuch ?—Arabic, Christian, and Jewish traditions—The ready scribe—The development theory—When did the middle books of the Pentateuch originate ?—Deuteronomy presupposes a code—Harmony—Tendencies of modern criticism—The loss of an ultimate authority—“My words shall not pass away.”

THE object of the preceding discussion has been mainly to determine whether there is any irreconcilable difference between the priestly and Deuteronomic legislation in regard to priests and Levites.

After a brief review of the ground which we have passed over, it will remain for us to consider (1) whether Moses was the author of Deuteronomy, and (2) to examine the claims advanced by some critics in favour of Ezra's authorship of the middle books of the Pentateuch.

We have shown (1) that it was neither the intention

of the Deuteronomist to confer the privilege of the priesthood upon all Levites, nor to exclude all other persons from it. (2) We have proved that the term "priests Levites" is used where evidently only descendants of Aaron are intended. Hence we have no right to claim here that every Levite might become a priest.

While the regulations about tithes and firstlings are not easy of explanation, yet they admit of adjustment. The apparent contradiction in the disposition of the firstlings of the flocks disappears in the way which we have indicated. Certainly, on the supposition that Ezra arranged the priestly legislation according to his own views, it is strange, if there be really a contradiction in these laws, that he did not discover and remove it.

Further, as it has been claimed that Ezekiel was the bridge between Deuteronomy and the middle books of the Pentateuch, we examined his references to the priests. We failed to find (1) that the sons of Zadok were the forerunners of the Aaronitic priesthood, or (2) that the distinction between priests and Levites first arose in his time.

We have proved not only that Ezekiel was not the author of Lev. xvii.—xxvi., but also that he evidently refers to other portions of the middle books of the Pentateuch, not to speak of the so-called Book of the Covenant.¹

Inasmuch as the critics claim that any person might offer sacrifice before the Deuteronomic legislation, and

¹ Ex. xxi.—xxiii.

that there are no traces of the priestly ordinances from Joshua to 2 Kings, we examined these books, and found (1) that they gave very little opportunity for the mention of the priests, and were evidently the work of men who do not seem to have been connected with the priesthood, since the events are described from a layman's standpoint; (2) that none but specially privileged persons appear as offering sacrifices, showing that sacrifices were only exceptionally offered, if ever, by any but the legitimate priesthood; (3) that a succession of high priests can be sufficiently traced; (4) that although the Levites are most rarely mentioned, except in Joshua and Judges, a distinction is once made between priests and Levites in Kings.¹

It has been claimed that the Chronicler has re-written the history from a priestly standpoint, and has either wilfully or unintentionally perverted the facts, so as to represent the history as if the middle books of the Pentateuch had originated in the time of Moses, instead of after the exile under Ezra.

Against this supposition, however, we observed that the Chronicler, when he agreed with Samuel and the Kings, followed the same representations almost word for word. Hence, when he quotes, as he does, from many other authors who are no longer in existence, we might expect a similar use of their material. Considering that he quotes these other authorities, we have no right to charge him with falsifying the history to suit his own ideas, when he deviates

¹ 1 Kings viii. 4.

from our Book of Kings. While the text may have suffered here and there through the errors of transcribers, yet our investigation leads us to consider his representations as substantially trustworthy.

Since it has been asserted that the Israelitish religion first arose with the prophets, and that there is an antagonism between them and the priests, we have examined the prophetical writings to see if this claim were justified. The result has shown that this antagonism, so far as it exists, is directed not against the priesthood, but against unworthy priests. In the oldest records which the prophets have left us, the priests seem to have occupied an honourable position.

Moreover, we find not infrequent references in the prophets of the eighth century to the middle books of the Pentateuch, while in Malachi, who prophesied after the promulgation of the priestly legislation, the priests and Levites are not distinguished, and no express mention is made of the priests as sons of Aaron.

It does not seem to us that, in regard to the priests, an irreconcilable difference is established between the priestly and the Deuteronomic legislation. The middle books of the Pentateuch contain specific legislation in regard to them. Deuteronomy, as we have already observed, does not distinctly admit the Levites to the priesthood. It may be claimed that this admission is implied. Implication, however, is not enough. If we were to suppose that it was the intention of the Deuteronomist to change the priestly law, and open the priesthood to all Levites, it would still be un-

natural to suppose that so radical a change would be made on such slight hints as these.

On the other hand, if we were to follow the recent critics, we could only conclude that it had long been the custom of the Levites to exercise the priest's office. On this subject the Deuteronomist does not legislate. But we have shown, as it seems to us conclusively, that Levitical and Aaronite priests can be one and the same, and that both expressions are used by the Chronicler, who certainly understood the difference.

Since the apparent contradictions in regard to tithes and firstlings between the middle books of the Pentateuch and Deuteronomy can be reconciled, there is no need of supposing so long an interval between them as is assigned by modern critics.

Who, then, was the author of Deuteronomy? We know that if the critics were not prejudiced by their theories, they would consider Moses the most available author. It is difficult to see how a man who could compose such a book could be anything less than a historic personage. Hilkiah, to whom some are inclined to assign the authorship of Deuteronomy, for the sake of fixing responsibility somewhere, exhibits no traits which render it probable that he was the author of the book.

The internal evidence for the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy is very strong. The plan and the execution either imply that Moses wrote it, or else that it was the product of a master in fictitious composition. Kuenen pays the following tribute to its

author: "We are even more struck by the tone which the Deuteronomist adopts, than by the fitness of the plan. It is true he has been accused, not without reason, of diffuseness and monotony. If, however, as justice demands, we leave out of consideration Deut. i.-iv. and xxix., xxx., which are later editions, even though they be from his own hand, there are but few repetitions left, and those few are decidedly not prejudicial. On the contrary, they testify to the great zeal and conscientiousness with which the author writes. It is as if he were afraid of saying too little, and again and again resumes the thread of the exhortation, in order, if possible, still to win some. His exhortations breathe a spirit of fervour and love which is very affecting."¹

Now what person does the history of Israel present, who was better able than Moses to prepare such a document on the eve of his decease? Only on this supposition do we have an explanation of the very brief, and, to the critic, very unsatisfactory references to the priests and the tribe to which they belong. He was too shrewd a man, and valued his opportunity too highly, to spend his breath in repeating that which was so well known, nay, was daily before the eyes of the people, as the order of worship, the duties and emoluments of the priesthood and their assistants.

From memory he recalls, with remarkable freshness, as much as is necessary of the Israelitish history, just as it occurs to him at the time. He speaks from

¹ *The Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. pp. 21, 22.

experience, emphasizes an old law, modifies it as the result of his observation through more than an entire generation, without thought or anxiety concerning the cross-examination which would arise as to the apparent differences between his reported speech and the existing documents.

His mind in the presence of a national assembly tends to generalize. He throws out principles in bold outline, and speaks of tribes rather than individuals. He passes over Aaron, who is dead, with the briefest mention, although he does not thereby disparage his memory. His object is not eulogy. The tribe of Levi stands before him as the living embodiment of the priesthood. Hence he naturally speaks of the Levitical rather than of the Aaronitic priests. Supposing the priestly law was already in existence, there was no object in his speaking of the priests as the sons of Aaron. It was rather natural in addressing, as it were, the nation which was composed of twelve tribes, that he should connect the name of the tribe of Levi with that which gave it its honour and dignity, nay more, its very subsistence, the priesthood.

As regards the authorship of Deuteronomy, we have, besides, the positive testimony that “Moses wrote this law,” not to speak of the strong personality which pervades the book. Of course, on Kuenen’s theory and that of other critics, we may believe that the author assumed the character of Moses for the sake of influence.¹ But this is fatal to our belief that

¹ Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. pp. 18, 19.

Deuteronomy is a divinely revealed book. The Christian experience very properly revolts from the idea that God could sanction the systematic fiction, "These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel," and especially, "And Moses wrote this law," as the medium of his revelation, if Moses did not write it, but some one else.

There can be no relief for the ordinary mind in the assumption that ideas of literary property were not so nice in those times.¹ This theory might be admissible, if we did not acknowledge in Deuteronomy the record of a divine revelation. The assertion, however, that Moses wrote this book is too positive, and its whole texture is too real and favourable to that authorship, for us to accept an explanation which strikes at the very foundations of morality.

We do not deny that there are critical difficulties in the way of accepting the Mosaic authorship, but those occasioned by the assumption of an authorship by Hilkiah or one of his contemporaries are vastly greater.

That Moses should have foreseen the future woes of his people,—that he should have anticipated the rise of the kingdom, and spoken accordingly,—that he should speak of these things with prophetic certainty,—can only be a stumbling-block to those who deny the possibility of a divine revelation of the future.

¹ Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. pp. 18, 19: "At a time when notions about literary property were yet in their infancy, an action of this kind was not regarded as unlawful. Men used to perpetrate such fictions as these without any qualms of conscience."

We now turn to consider the questions whether, as some modern critics claim, Ezra was the author of the middle books of the Pentateuch. Since Graf,¹ Kuenen,² and Colenso³ hold that the various traditions are favourable to this view, we shall examine them somewhat in detail, to see if this conjecture has any real foundation.

Let us first consider the latest traditions, tracing them, if possible, to their Jewish originals. Are we to believe, with the critics, that there cannot be so much smoke without some fire? or, if we may use a very homely illustration, is this perhaps an exemplification of the story of the three black crows?

1. In the ninth Sura (A.D. 631) of the Koran, this assertion is found: "The Jews say, Ezra (*Ozair*) is the son of God." Of course such an assertion could not stand without protest on the part of the Jews. Therefore the commentators (Beidhawi, † A.D. 1292, etc.) have sought to substantiate the prophet's words by saying "that it is meant of some ancient heterodox Jews, or else of some Jews of Medina, who said so for no other reason than that the law, being utterly lost and forgotten during the Babylonish captivity, Ezra, having been raised to life after he had been dead one hundred years, dictated the whole anew to the scribes, out of his own memory; at which they greatly marvelled, and declared that he could not have done it, unless

¹ *Die Geschichtlichen Bücher*, S. 72.

² *The Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 232.

³ *Lectures on the Pentateuch*, p. 313.

he were the son of God.”¹ That this legend does not rest immediately upon Jewish tradition, but upon the Christian development of the story in Ezra xiv., will appear as we go on.

2. Augustine († 430) says : “ Ezra, the priest of God, restored the law, which had been burned by the Chaldeans in the archives of the temple. For indeed he was full of the same spirit with which the Scriptures had previously been filled.”² In the same strain, Jerome († 420) affirms : “ Whether you choose to say that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, or that Ezra was the restorer of the same work, I have no objections.”³

It will be seen, however, that the quotations from the older Fathers, who now follow, unless we except Irenaeus, do not speak of Ezra as the restorer of the Thorah, but of the Scriptures, and Jewish literature in general. Clement of Alexandria († about 220) : “ Moreover, in the captivity of Nebuchadnezzar, when the Scriptures had been destroyed in the time of Artaxerxes, king of the Persians, Ezra the Levite, the priest, having become inspired, recalled again, prophetically, all the ancient Scriptures.”⁴ Tertullian (* 160) :

¹ Sale, *The Koran*, London 1734, p. 153, note a.

² *De Mirabilibus Sacrae Scripturae*, ii. 33 : “ Esdras Dei sacerdos combustam a Chaldaeis in archivis templi restituit Legem. Nempe qui eodem Spiritu, quo ante Scripta fuerat, plenus fuerit.”

³ *Adversus Helvidium* : “ Sive Moysen dicere volueris auctorem Pentateuchi ; sive Esdram ejusdem instauratorem operis, non recuso.”

⁴ *Stromata*, i. 22: Καὶ ν τῇ Ναβουχοδονόσορῳ αἰχμαλωσίᾳ διαφθαρεισῶν τῶν γραφῶν κατὰ τοὺς Ἀρταξέρξους τῶν Περσῶν βασιλέως χρόνους,

“And it is well known that when Jerusalem was destroyed by the Babylonians, every document of Jewish literature was restored by Ezra.”¹ Irenaeus († 202): “When, in the captivity of the people by Nebuchadnezzar, the Scriptures were corrupted, and after seventy years the Jews went up to their country, then in the times of Artaxerxes, king of the Persians, he inspired Ezra the priest, of the tribe of Levi, to set in order the words of all the former prophets, and to restore to the people the legislation by Moses.”²

Undoubtedly all these traditions of the Fathers have been derived more or less directly from the apocryphal story in the so-called Fourth Book of Ezra xiv., which was written in the latter part of the first century (or 81–96 A.D.³). In vers. 20–22, Ezra is represented as saying, “Therefore the world is put in darkness, and they who dwell in it are without light, because Thy law has been burned; on which account no one knows what has been done by Thee, or what works they shall begin. If I have found grace with Thee, send into me the

ἐπίπνους Ἐσδρας ὁ Λευΐτης ὁ ἱερεὺς γενόμενος πάσας τὰς παταίας αὐθίς ἀνανεύμενος προεφήτευσε γραφάς.

¹ *De cultu feminarum (de hab. mul.)*, i. 3: “Et Hierosolymis Babylonia expugnatione deletis, omne instrumentum Judaiae literaturae per Esdram constat restauratum.”

² *Adversus Haereses*, iii. 24. 1: ‘Ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ Ναζουχοδονόσορ αἰχμαλωτίᾳ τοῦ λαοῦ διαφθαρεισῶν τῶν γραφῶν, καὶ μετὰ ἐβδομήκοντα ἔτη τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀνελθίντων εἰς, τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν, ἔπειτα ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις Ἀστυξέοδου τοῦ Ηεροῦ Βασιλέως, ἐνέπνευσεν Ἐσδρα τῷ ἱεροὶ ἐπ τῆς φυλῆς Λευΐτης, τοὺς τῶν προγεγούτων προφητῶν πάντας ἀνατάξασθαι λόγους, καὶ ἀποκαταστῆσαι τῷ λαῷ τὴν διὰ Μωϋσέως νομοθεσίαν.

³ See Schürer, *Lehrbuch der N. T. Zeitgeschichte*, Leipzig 1874, p. 563.

Holy Spirit, and I will write all which has been done in the world from the beginning, which were written in Thy law, so that men may be able to find the way,"¹ etc.

That Ezra's work was much more extensive than the reproduction of the Thorah, appears from vers. 44-47: "But they (*i.e.* the five scribes) wrote in forty days ninety-four (or, according to another reading, two hundred and four) books. And it came to pass, when the forty days had been completed, the Most High spake to me, saying, Publish the former things which thou hast written, and let the worthy and the unworthy read them; but the seventy latest things thou shalt preserve, that thou mayest deliver them to the wise of thy people. For in them is a rill of understanding, and a fountain of wisdom, and a river of knowledge. And I did so."²

3. This fiction, as has been suggested by Herzfeld, probably has no more substantial foundation than the following Jewish tradition: "The Thorah was forgotten

¹ "Positum est ergo saeculum in tenebris, et qui inhabitant in eo sine lumine. Quoniam lex tua incensa est, propter quod nemo scit quae a te facta sunt, vel quae incipient opera. Si enim inveni coram te gratiam, immittre in me Spiritum sanctum, et scribain omne quod factum est in saeculo ab initio, quae erant in lege tua scripta, ut possint homines invenire semitam," etc.

² "Scripti sunt autem per quadraginta dies libri nonaginta quatuor (the common reading is *ducenti quatuor*). Et factum est, cum completi essent quadraginta dies, locutus est Altissimus, dicens: Priora quae scripsisti in palam pone, et legant digni et indigni, novissimos autem septuaginta conservabis, ut tradas eos sapientibus de populo tuo. In his enim est vena intellectus, et sapientiae fons, et scientiae flumen. Et feci sic."

by the Israelites, until Ezra went up from Babylon and re-established it. It was forgotten again until Hillel the Babylonian went up and re-established it. It was forgotten again until Rabbi Chija and his sons re-established it.”¹ Two things are here worthy of remark,—(1) that nothing is said of the Thorah having been destroyed—it is merely said that it was forgotten; and (2) that afterwards others besides Ezra re-established it in the memory of the people.

There is nowhere any hint in the Talmud that Ezra was the author of the priestly legislation of the Pentateuch, or of any part of it.

(1.) Jewish tradition informs us specifically as to the products of his pen, and the regulations (*תורת הקהילות*, not *תורה*) which are ascribed to him: “Ezra wrote his book and the genealogy of the Chronicles to his own (genealogy).² From this follows what Rabbi taught, who was instructed by Rabbi Judah: Ezra did not depart from Babylon until he had proved his Jewish extraction.”³ This classical passage in *Baba bathra* is especially significant, since, if the writer had considered Ezra the author of the Pentateuch, as Professor Franz Delitzsch has well observed,⁴ he would not have hesitated to say so, while fearlessly informing us that the

¹ *Succa* 20a.

² Rashi understands by this the entire Chronicles until the time of Ezra. See Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Nordhausen 1855, B. i. S. 128.

³ *Baba bathra* 15a.

⁴ *Der Ezra der Ueberlieferung und der Ezra der neusten Pentateuchkritik*, in Delitzsch’s *Zeitschrift*, Leipzig 1877, S. 448.

college of Hezekiah wrote Isaiah, Proverbs, the Song of Solomon, and Ecclesiastes; and that the Great Synagogue wrote Ezekiel, the twelve prophets, Daniel, and Esther. Besides these portions of the Old Testament, ten regulations are ascribed to Ezra, which have no similarity to the laws of the Pentateuch, but are distinguished from them through their post-exilic and minute character; while some of them, perhaps, are not unworthy of him, others are far too indelicate to be named before chaste ears.¹

(2.) Jewish tradition instructs us as to the nature of Ezra's relation to the text of the Pentateuch: "In the beginning the law was given to Israel in Hebrew writing and the sacred language. But it was given to them in the days of Ezra in the Assyrian writing and the Aramaic language. . . . Ezra was worthy that the law should have been given by him, if Moses had not preceded him. In Moses it is said, And Moses went up unto God.² In Ezra it is said, This Ezra went up from Babylon.³ As the ascent which is mentioned here is the Thorah (*i.e.* on account of the Thorah), so that ascent was Thorah (*i.e.* on account of the Thorah). In Moses it is said, And the Lord commanded me at that time to teach you statutes and judgments.⁴ In Ezra it is said, For Ezra had prepared his heart to seek the Thorah of Jehovah, and to do it, and to teach Israel statutes and judgments.⁵

¹ *Baba kamma* 82a. These regulations are given by Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, B. ii. S. 242.

² Ex. xix. 3. ³ Ezra vii. 6. ⁴ Deut. iv. 14. ⁵ Ezra vii. 10.

*And although the Thorah was not given by him, the writing was changed by him.*¹ Here, then, while the Rabbis institute a comparison between Moses and Ezra on account of the accidental similarity of expression in the passages quoted, it is distinctly said that Ezra was not the author of the Thorah.

Further, the Rabbis trace certain extraordinary antemasoretic forms of punctuation to him. In *Bamidbar rabba*, c. iii. *infra*, and in *Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan*, c. xxxiv., the question is raised: “To what end are the eleven points over עַד־עַלְמָן וְלֹא־נִזְנֵן עַד ?² The explanation is as follows: Ezra thought, when Elias shall come and say to me, Why hast thou written thus? I will answer, I have indeed pointed it above; and when he shall say, You have written correctly, I will remove the punctuation above.” A similar story is related in *Piske Tosephoth Menachoth*:³ “As Ezra wrote the Thorah, he made a point over the internal *vav* of וְעַשְׂרָה.⁴ He thought, when Moses shall say, Why did you put a point over it? I will answer, I have not indeed blotted it (the ו) out.” Since these traditions represent Ezra as so anxious about the punctuation of a few letters in the Thorah, and therefore only as a transcriber of the Thorah, they certainly afford a striking contrast to the theories of those who suppose that Ezra wrote the priestly portions of the Pentateuch.

(3.) Jewish tradition represents Ezra as the author

¹ *Sanhedrin* 21b.

² *Deut.* xxix. 28.

³ § 231.

⁴ *Num.* xxix. 15. We are indebted for the last two quotations to Prof. Delitzsch's article, to which we have referred above.

of a regulation which conflicts in an important particular with the priestly legislation. As is well known, the Israelites were required to give their tithes directly to the Levites, who were bidden to give a tenth of them to the priests. This, however, as the Rabbis say, was changed by Ezra. “Johanan¹ the high priest abolished thanks at the tithing. What was the reason? Rabbi Jose, Chanina’s son, says: Because they did not give it exactly according to the original institution, for it is said in the Scriptures that they should give it to the Levites, but we give it to the priests.”² The reason why they did not give the tithes to the Levites is assigned in the following passages: Why did they punish the Levites in regard to the tithes? because in the time of Ezra they did not go up (from Babylon to Jerusalem). In *Chullin*³ it is distinctly said that Ezra punished the Levites by withholding from them the tithes. It will be seen from this that there is a great difference between the Ezra of the critics, who, according to them, so clearly commanded that the tithes should be given to the Levites,⁴ and that *they* should give a tenth of them to the priests,⁵ and the Ezra of tradition, who deprived the Levites of them.

It will doubtless be admitted that if Ezra had been considered the author of the Pentateuch, or any part of it, in the time of Josephus (* 37 A.D.), that eminent Jewish historian would have given us some hint of it,

¹ Neh. xii. 23.

² *Sota* ix. 10, and its Gemara, 47b.

³ *Chullin* 131b.

⁴ Num. xviii. 24.

⁵ *Ibid.* vers. 26-28.

but he simply says that Ezra was sufficiently acquainted with the laws of Moses. This must indeed seem faint praise to the critics!¹

We think, after this examination of the Arabic, the Christian, and the Jewish traditions in regard to Ezra, that no candid critic can any longer find in them a support for the theory that he was the author of the priestly portions of the Pentateuch.

Let us now briefly determine whether there is any foundation in the Scriptures for the assumption that Ezra was the author of the Pentateuch.

The only passages which can be relied upon for our controversy are: "This Ezra went up from Babylon; and he was a ready scribe in the law of Moses, which the Lord God of Israel had given." Now the question is not what grammatical possibilities are in this passage, or what may be tortured out of it, but rather what lies on the very face of it. It was either the purpose of the author to state in clear and explicit terms that Ezra was the author of the law of Moses, which is rather more than the modern critics desire us to believe, or simply to state that he was a "ready scribe in the law of Moses." The critics may depend upon it that there is no esoteric meaning hidden in these words, which has been concealed for more than two thousand years from the author's contemporaries and the succeeding generations of Rabbis. The Jewish tradition, as we have seen, excludes such a possibility. What, then, is meant by

¹ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, xi. 5: Πορτος ἱερεὺς τοῦ λαοῦ. καλούμενος "Εσδρας, ὃς τῶν Μωϋσέως νόμων ἴκανός ἐμπειρος.

Ezra's being a "ready scribe" (סופר מהיר) ? Some of the Rabbis in the Talmud have supposed that the occupation indicated by *sopher* (scribe) was that of counting, and that the *sophrim* (scribes) received their names because they counted the letters of the Thorah.¹ There can be no doubt, however, that this is not the meaning of the designation as applied to Ezra, but rather that he possessed unusual skill in transcribing the Thorah, combined with the rarest knowledge of its contents, as is indicated in vii. 10: "For Ezra had prepared his heart to seek the law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments." We may indeed consider him as a scribe in the New Testament sense.² These, then, were no common qualities. He was more than a mechanical copyist, more than a mere counter of words. He understood what he wrote as well as what he read, and in this respect was undoubtedly far superior to the later *Sophrim*, the predecessors of the *Massorites*.³ Here, then, Jewish tradition and the Scriptures fail the critics, and their claim for Ezra's authorship of the priestly legislation must stand or fall on its own merits.

¹ *Chagigah* 15b; *Kiddushin* 30a; *Synhedrin* 106b.

² This meaning of scribe (γραμματεύς) "in sacro codice legis mosaicae et Scripturae sacrae peritus" occurs in the Targum, e.g. 1 Chron. xxv. 8, ספרא עם תלמידא, *the teacher with the pupil*, and is applied to Moses in the second Jerusalem Targum on Num. xi. 26. מישָׁה נבִיא ספָרָה רִישָׁאָל, *the prophet Moses, the teacher of Israel*. Compare Grimm, *Lexicon Græco-Latinum in Libros N.T.*, Lipsiae 1868, and Levy, *Chaldaïsches Wörterbuch*, Leipzig 1867-68.

³ Levy, in his *Chaldaïsches Wörterbuch*, cites the following passages from the Talmud, which show the influence of the

It is claimed that this priestly code must have been the result of development. But, according to the arguments of the critics themselves, the most important elements in this development were products of the period between 625 and 458 B.C., or, more exactly speaking, during the latter part of the exile, and the time before Ezra's arrival. Indeed, we must, if we accept the views of the modern critics, regard the priestly legislation as Ezra's adaptation and improvement of what Ezekiel had already done before him,—a pure invention of Ezra, and perhaps of contemporary priests, since it was not allowed the Israelites to offer sacrifices to the Lord outside of the Holy Land. Now, if one man could do so much before 458 B.C. and the thirteen following years, which, according to Kuenen, he spent in preparing and adapting the priestly Thorah, why might not Moses do the same by means of divine instruction? What shall we say of a development which in the time from Moses, 1320¹ B.C., to Josiah, 625 B.C., only gets as far as Levitical priests, and in a single generation can develope the Aaronitic priesthood, and the high priest with all his glory? Such a theory

Sophrim:—*Jerusalem Gemara*, i. 4: “The words of the scribes are more important than the words of the Thorah.” He adds: “The oldest interpreters of the Scriptures, as well as the transmitters of the oldest traditional teaching, are to be understood under the word **סופרים**. The word is therefore properly to be considered as a denominative of **ספר**.”

¹ We take the date of the exodus as given by Duncker, who is often quoted by the critics, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, Leipzig 1874, B. i. S. 334.

must lead us to suppose that Ezra promulgated a programme. But if we can believe that Ezra was the author of a programme, what difficulty is there in supposing that God enabled Moses to publish the same programme? and that after an experience of about thirty-eight years, we have an adaptation of this programme to the wants of the people?

When we turn now to consider the relative age of the middle books of the Pentateuch, we have an important argument for their pre-Deuteronomic origin, in the fact that the Deuteronomist evidently had in mind, at least nearly as extensive a code of laws as we possess in the priestly legislation. If this were not the case, it would be inconceivable that, with the exception of the Book of the Covenant, a popular address should be produced, in which allusions were made to laws, but in which the laws themselves were not fully given. There are really no regulations in regard to priests and sacrifices in Deuteronomy. Hence it presupposes a code, and one much fuller than the Book of the Covenant.¹ Now the question is, whether essentially the middle books of the Pentateuch can have preceded Deutero-

¹ Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, ii. p. 8, thus describes it: "The oldest collection [of laws] which we know, the so-called Book of the Covenant [Ex. xxi.-xxiii.], contains a number of precepts concerning the civil life, of which the majority are obviously taken from existing customs. But side by side with these we find purely moral commandments and admonitions, for which express motives are alleged, *i.e.* which are made dependent on the assent of the reader. The book concludes with a thoroughly prophetic discourse, setting forth the blessing attached to the observance of Jahveh's laws, and the curse to their neglect."

nomy. We should consider this a necessity, even if we held that it had arisen in the time of Hilkiah, since, for the reasons which we have already named, Deuteronomy is not, and cannot be, an independent book.

It has been said that there is an irreconcilable chasm between the priestly and the Deuteronomic legislation. This, however, is not the case. The Deuteronomist does not legislate in regard to the two most important things in the hierarchy, priests and sacrifices. As we have already proved, the mention of priests Levites does not sanction the appointment of any Levite to the priesthood, nor does it exclude the Aaronitic priests.

We have then the reconciliation of laws in regard to the disposition of the tithes,—a matter which occasions difficulties, but by no means insuperable ones. That these passages are the source of perplexity to the honest critic, is no proof that they cannot be harmonized. The Jewish interpreters have harmonized them; and they probably did not give the slightest difficulty to the contemporaries of the great lawgiver. We can in all sincerity affirm that we feel satisfied that these passages admit of being reconciled in the way which we have proposed.

This much is certain, that when we hold that the middle books of the Pentateuch precede Deuteronomy, the history of the priesthood may be traced without difficulty, although at times, owing to the prominence of other interests, with less distinctness. The connec-

tion of the books is a natural one, since we find references in the oldest prophets not only to Deuteronomy,¹ but also, at least, to some passages in the middle books of the Pentateuch, not to speak of Genesis. If, however, we accept the modern theory, the whole history is thrown into inextricable confusion, and we have, as Kuenen affirms, no reliable history except that which we find in the prophetic writings.

If we accept the premises of modern criticism, we must also accept its conclusions. The Bible at once sinks to the level of other books. It is no longer God's revelation to man. Its supernatural character is at once lost. The Old Testament ceases to be preparatory for Christianity as the religion of divine revelation. There is no sin, and no need of a Saviour. From this point we can very readily accept the positions of a Haeckel, and deny the existence of a personal God. We cannot see any stopping-place.

If, however, Christian faith is to be maintained consistently with these modern critical views, as some affirm that it can, the possibility of harmony must be so established that these new views of the Scriptures may address themselves to the understanding of the

¹ Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 18: "Immediately after Josiah's reformation, it [Deuteronomy] is frequently used by the prophet Jeremiah; the prophets of the eighth century B.C., on the contrary, are not yet acquainted with it,—undoubtedly because it did not yet exist in their time." For examples of some striking correspondences between Deuteronomy and the prophets of the eighth century B.C., see Appendix ii.

Church, without doing violence to the consciences of believers.

If we relinquish the Bible,—and the issue of the present discussion involves this,—what have we in its place? At the Reformation, we left the traditions of a fallible Church to stand on God’s word. To what ultimate authority can we appeal, when we have once undermined the authority of the Bible?

They err who regard the Scriptures as a decaying house, which must ever be propped up with timbers lest it should fall. *We* may suffer from false views in regard to its origin and inspiration. *It* will stand triumphant when the eternal cliffs have been worn away by the violence of the ocean, strong and immovable in Him who hath said, “Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.”

APPENDIX I.

THE SOURCES OF THE CHRONICLER.

I. **I**T is clear that when the Chronicler refers to the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel, 1 Chron. ix. 1, 2 Chron. xvi. 11, xxv. 26, xxvii. 7, xxviii. 26, xxxii. 32, xxxv. 27, xxxvi. 8, or to the Book of Kings, 2 Chron. xx. 34, or to the Midrash (Commentary) of the Book of Kings, 2 Chron. xxiv. 27, he does not intend our Books of Kings, for many reasons, of which we give the following examples:—

1. The canonical Books of Kings do not contain the registration of all Israel, which is assigned to the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah, 1 Chron. ix. 1: “So all Israel were reckoned by genealogies: and, behold, they were written in the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah.”

2. If we translate 2 Chron. xx. 34, “Now the rest of the acts of Jehoshaphat, first and last, behold, they are written in the words of Jehu the son of Hanani, which were received [instead of ‘mentioned,’ as in the English version] into the Book of the Kings of Israel,” we find that while Jehu is mentioned as pro-

phesying against Baasha, he has nothing to say about Jehoshaphat.

3. The rest of the acts of Amaziah, first and last, 2 Chron. xxv. 26, and the rest of the acts of Jotham, xxvii. 7, and all his wars and his ways, are not found in the canonical Books of Kings, since the same material, in almost the same form, and more complete, is found in Chronicles (compare 2 Kings xiv. 1-20 with 2 Chron. xxv. ; 2 Kings xv. 32-38 with 2 Chron. xxvii.).

4. Manasseh's prayer unto God, and the words of the seers that spake to him, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 18, are not given in our Books of Kings (compare 2 Kings xxi. 1-18 with 2 Chron. xxxiii. 1-20).

II. It is certain that the Chronicler refers to works which are not contained in our canonical books.

1. The visions of Iddo (or Jedo, who was perhaps another person from those who follow) the seer against Jeroboam the son of Nebat, 2 Chron. ix. 29 ; the words of Iddo the seer concerning genealogies, 2 Chron. xii. 15 ; and the Commentary (Midrash) of Iddo, 2 Chron. xiii. 22, do not occur in our Books of Kings, but probably refer to writings of the persons named which were used by the Chronicler.

2. The acts of Uzziah, which were written by Isaiah the son of Amoz, 2 Chron. xxvi. 22, are neither to be found in the canonical Books of Kings nor in the prophecy of Isaiah, who, to be sure, mentions Uzziah, Isa. i. 1, vi. 1, as he does Jotham and Ahaz, i. 1, vii. 1, 3, 10,

12, xiv. 28, xxxviii. 8. But it is clear that the writing of Isaiah in regard to Uzziah is entirely independent of such a passing notice as he gives him in his prophecy.

3. The Commentary on the Book of Kings, which is quoted as giving particulars respecting the sons of Joash, the greatness of the burdens laid upon him, and the repairing of the house of God, 2 Chron. xxiv. 27, is no longer in existence, but was still accessible to the Chronicler and his contemporaries.

4. Since we have established the independence of these sources, it seems to us in the highest degree improbable, that when the Chronicler mentions other authorities whose names appear in our Books of Kings, he simply refers, after the Jewish fashion, to sections where their names occur.

(1.) When he quotes the words of Samuel the seer as one of his authorities for the life of David, 1 Chron. xxix. 29, he evidently refers to one of the sources of our two canonical books which were originally one.

(2.) If, however, we understand him as quoting historical documents of Samuel, what is to prevent us from understanding that Nathan the prophet and Gad the seer were the authors of other documents, from which the Chronicler might have derived his account of the activity of the priests and Levites in the time of David? This supposition derives some probability from 2 Chron. xxix. 25: "And he set the Levites in the house of the Lord with cymbals, with psalteries, and with harps, according to the commandment of David, and Gad the king's seer, and Nathan the

prophet, for so was the commandment of the Lord by His prophets." Since Gad's words are as fully given in 1 Chron. xxi. 9-19 as in 2 Sam. xxiv. 11-19, we have good reason for believing that, as we have already intimated, he is author of an independent work.

(3.) The Chronicler cites Shemaiah with Iddo as containing the acts of Rehoboam first and last, 2 Chron. xii. 15; but he could not have referred to 1 Kings xii. 22-24, where Shemaiah's prophecy occurs, which he repeats with slight variations, 2 Chron. xi. 2-4. Shemaiah has undoubtedly given fuller accounts of Rehoboam's reign than are found in these three verses.

(4.) We have no warrant for understanding that one original Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel is indicated under the different authorities which are quoted. This conclusion has been drawn from 2 Chron. xx. 34, which mentions that the Book of Jehu the son of Hanani was embodied in the Book of Kings, and from xxxii. 32, where many read, "In the vision of Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz, in the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel."¹ The singling out of these two books as being reckoned under the Book of Kings would naturally lead us to suppose that the others were not reckoned in the same category. Besides, it is doubtful, in the second case, whether the vision of Isaiah is not to be understood as an authority besides the Book of Kings. This meaning is favoured by the translation of the Septua-

¹ Delitzsch, *Biblischer Commentar über Jesaja*, Leipzig 1869, S. xi. Bertheau, *Die Bücher der Chronik*, Leipzig 1873, S. xxxi.

gint,¹ which, together with Chaldee, is followed by the English version.

(5.) When we duly weigh all these points, we do not wonder that Graf was at last inclined to admit that he had gone too far in maintaining that the Chronicler had only freely adapted our Books of Kings to his own views.² We have, as it seems to us, abundantly shown that the Chronicler had reliable authorities, and that the assumption that he has deliberately changed the historical facts for a didactic purpose, is entirely without foundation.

(6.) The question now remains, In what shape did he consult these authorities? Professor Dr. Franz Delitzsch, my honoured friend and teacher, answers the question as follows:—The Chronicler had (1) our two Books of Samuel; (2) our two Books of Kings; (3) a *Midrash Sepher ha-Melakim*,—that is, a commentary on an older Book of Kings,—in which this

¹ Καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων Ἐζεκίου καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ ἰδοὺ γέγραπται ἐν τῇ προφητείᾳ Ἰσαίου νιοῦ Ἀμώς τοῦ προφήτου καὶ ἐπὶ βιβλίου βασιλέων Ἰούδα καὶ Ἰσραήλ. Jerome renders the passage: “Reliqua autem sermonum Ezechiae, et misericordiarum ejus scripta sunt in visione Isaiae filii Amos prophetae, et in libro regum Juda et Israel.”

² See Bertheau, S. viii., where he says: “In a letter to me, dated Feb. 19, 1866, Graf acknowledged that, in the effort to secure a fuller recognition of the independence of the Old Testament historian, he had represented the author of Chronicles as too independent and absolute; and since he too must himself agree that an extended continuation of the old annals lay before the author, it would ever remain to a certain extent doubtful how much he had added or remodelled after the merely oral tradition, or according to his own judgment.”

older book was illustrated by excerpts out of the official annals of Judah and Israel, and out of many prophetic documents of different times. It is probable that Ezra was the compiler of this great work, which closed with the history of his own time.

While we hold, with Professor Delitzsch, that the Chronicler had our Books of Samuel and Kings, we find no adequate proof that the mass of the material was comprehended under a compilation from the older documents named, or that the expression *Midrash Sepher ha-Melakim* is equivalent to *Sepher Malchē Israel re-Jehuda*. (a) As we have already observed, there is no evidence that *Dibrē Nathan*,¹ *Dibrē Gad*,¹ *Nebuath Ahijah*,² *Chazoth Yedo*,² *Dibrē Shemaiah*,³ *Dibrē Iddo*, and *Midrash Iddo*⁴ were contained in one work. Indeed, it is far more probable that they existed as independent documents. The fact that the work of Jehu the son of Hanani is mentioned as being embodied in the Book of Kings,⁵ 2 Chron. xx. 34, does not indicate that those above mentioned were collected in the same work; it rather shows that the others were not included in it. (b) Although the Chronicler does not quote

¹ 1 Chron. xxix. 29.

² 2 Chron. ix. 29.

³ 2 Chron. xii. 15.

⁴ 2 Chron. xiii. 22.

⁵ The Septuagint and Chaldee version present quite a different idea: *οἱ λοιποὶ λόγοι, ἱωσαθάτοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ ἔσχατοι ἴδον γεγραμμένοι εἰς λόγοις, Ἰηοὺ τοῦ Ἀνανί, ὃς κατέγραψε βιβλίου βασιλέων Ἰσραηλ.* Chaldee: "And the rest of the acts of Jehoshaphat, first and last, behold, they are written in the acts of Jehu the son of Hanani, who was appointed as writer (לְכָלָר=librarius) on the memorials of the kings of the house of Israel." According to this, Jehu was one of the royal annalists.

his main source without some slight variations,¹ yet we cannot argue from this that he considers *Midrash Sepher ha-Melachim*² equivalent to *Sepher Malchē Israel*, which he mentions twice, or to *Sepher Malchē Jehuda re Israel*, to which he refers four times, much less that the above-mentioned documents of Nathan, Gad, etc., were all constituent parts of a larger work.

(7.) Our theory is that the Chronicler had access to these documents, which all illustrated the history of the regal period, and with which he was perfectly familiar. Since we cannot identify the *Sepher Malchē Jehuda re Israel* with *Dibrē ha-Yamīm*, which is so often quoted in the Book of Kings, it is probable that our present Book of Samuel and Kings lay before our author, from which he took the basis of an enlarged and modified work, which was enriched by the sources already mentioned, and which truly represents the course of history during the regal period from a Levitical standpoint.

¹ 2 Chron. xvi. 11, סִפְרֵי הַמֶּלֶכִים לִיהוָה וּיְשָׂרָאֵל. *Ibid.* xxvii. 7, סִפְרֵי מֶלֶכִים, 26, xxxii. 32, סִפְרֵי מֶלֶכִים יְשָׂרָאֵל וִיהוָה. יְהוָה וּיְשָׂרָאֵל.

² 2 Chron. xxiv. 27.

APPENDIX II.

THE MEANING OF THE WORD THORAH IN HOS. IV. 6.

KUENEN says:¹ “The original word *Thorah* really means ‘teaching,’ ‘instruction,’ and is used by the prophets to indicate their own preaching, and that of their predecessors. . . . Now, as early as the eighth century B.C., the prophetic exhortations, after they had been delivered orally, were committed to writing; therefore it is possible that the prophets had such writings in their thoughts when they mentioned the Thorah of Jahveh. Nothing hinders us from even assuming that they had in view collections of laws and admonitions to which a higher antiquity or even a Mosaic origin was attributed. But in that case they have still made no essential distinction between those laws and their own preaching, and have ascribed to the former no higher authority.”

This is indeed a cautious statement, but it is ambiguous, since the second part contradicts the first. The word *Thorah*, as is well known, is often used in the general sense of religious and moral instruction. Even when the expression, the law of Moses, or the

¹ *The Religion of Israel*, vol. i. p. 55 seq.

book of the law of Moses,¹ is employed, we cannot prove that the whole Pentateuch is intended, unless the connection seems to indicate it; *e.g.*, from the reference in 2 Kings xiv. 6, we cannot affirm that anything else is meant than the Book of Deuteronomy. It is clear when Isaiah says,² “Give ear unto the law of our God,” that he refers to his own preaching, because that preaching is as much the “word of the Lord” as the Mosaic Thorah. But in Hos. iv. 6 the case is different. There is nothing in his words to indicate that he meant by Thorah his own teaching. Indeed, the connection is against it, for the priests were properly custodians of the law of Moses.³ Duhm,⁴ as has already been remarked, thinks that Hosea, in iv. 2, was guided by the Decalogue. But we proceed further, and find it certain that striking correspondences exist between Hosea and every book of the Pentateuch.

We pass over vi. 7 (comp. Gen. iii.) and other passages which are given in Delitzsch's *Commentar über die Genesis*, Leipzig 1872, S. 10.

HOSEA xii. 4, 5 (E. V. 3, 4).

GENESIS xxv. 26a:

“He took his brother by the heel in the womb, and by his brother out, and his hand took hold strength he had power with God: on Esau's heel.” xxxii. 28b: “For yea, he had power over the angel as a prince hast thou power with and prevailed: he wept and made God and with men, and hast pre-

¹ Josh. viii. 31, xxiii. 6; 2 Kings xxiii. 25; 2 Chron. xxiii. 18, xxx. 16; Ezra iii. 2, vii. 6; Neh. viii. 1; Dan. ix. 11; Mal. iii. 22 (E. V. iv. 4).

² Isa. i. 10.

³ Deut. xxxi. 9.

⁴ *Theologie der Propheten*, S. 131.

supplication unto him: he found him in Bethel, and there he spake with us."

HOSEA i. 10.

"Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered."

xii. 13 (E. V. 12).

"And Jacob fled into the country of Syria, and Israel served for a wife, and for a wife he kept sheep."

xi. 1.

"When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt."

ii. 15.

"And she shall sing there as in the days of her youth, and as in the day when she came up out of the land of Egypt."

Ver. 17.

"For I will take away the names of Baalim out of her mouth."

xii. 9.

"I that am the Lord thy God from the land of Egypt will yet make thee to dwell in tabernacles, as in the days of the solemn feast."

iv. 10a.

"For they shall eat and not have enough."

vailed." xxxv. 15: "And Jacob called the name of the place where the Lord spake with him, Bethel."

GENESIS xxxii. 12.

"And Thou saidst, I will surely do thee good, and make thy seed as the sand of the sea, which cannot be numbered for multitude."

xxviii. 5.

"And he went to Padan-aram unto Laban, son of Bethuel the Syrian." xxix. 20a: "And Jacob served seven years for Rachel."

EXODUS.

Ex. iv. 22, 23a: "And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son; . . . and I say unto thee, Let my son go."

xv. 1.

"Then sang Moses and the children of Israel this song unto the Lord, and spake, saying, I will sing unto the Lord," etc.

xxiii. 13b.

"And make no mention of the name of other gods, neither let it be heard out of thy mouth."

LEVITICUS xxiii. 43.

"That your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt."

xxvi. 26b.

"Ye shall eat and not be satisfied."

HOSEA xi. 9.

“For I am God, and not man.”

ix. 10.

“I found Israel like grapes in the wilderness; I saw your fathers as the first-ripe in the fig-tree at her first time: but they went to Baal-peor, and separated themselves unto that shame.”

xiii. 5.

“I did know thee in the wilderness, in the land of great drought.”

ix. 4b.

“Their sacrifices shall be unto them as the bread of mourners; all that eat thereof shall be polluted.”

i. 2b.

“For the land hath committed great whoredom, departing from the Lord.”

NUMBERS xxiii. 19.

“God is not a man that He should lie.”

NUMBERS xxv. 3.

“And Israel joined himself unto Baal-peor.”

DEUTERONOMY viii. 15a.

“Who led thee through that great and terrible wilderness, wherein were fiery serpents, and scorpions, and drought.”

xxvi. 14a.

“I have not eaten thereof in my mourning, neither have I taken away aught thereof for any unclean use.”

xxxi. 16b.

“And this people will rise up and go a whoring after the gods of the strangers of the land.”

Now, when we consider that the prophet rejects the priests because they have forgotten the Thorah, and we find the prophet making so many allusions to the Pentateuch (not to speak of Judges and Samuel),¹ it

¹ Hos. ix. 9, *e.g.*: “They have deeply corrupted themselves, as in the days of Gibeah.” Comp. x. 9.

Judg. xix. 22: “The men of the city, certain sons of Belial, beset the house, saying, Bring forth the man that came into thine house, that we may know him.”

Hos. xiii. 10, 11: “I will be thy king: where is any other that may save thee in all thy cities? and thy judges of whom thou saidst, Give me a king and princes? I gave thee a king in mine anger, and took him away in my wrath.” Compare 1 Sam. viii. 5, 7, 19, xv. 22, 23, xvi. 1.

seems not only possible, but probable, that he alludes to essentially the same Thorah which is known to us.

A similar argument may be used with reference to Amos' employment of the word Thorah, ii. 4 : "Thus saith the Lord ; For three transgressions of Judah, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof, because they have despised the law (Thorah) of the Lord, and have not kept His commandments." The following passages show that Amos was not unacquainted with at least portions of our present Thorah :

AMOS iv. 11.

"I have overthrown some of you, as God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah."

iv. 10.

"I have sent among you the pestilence, after the manner of Egypt."

v. 17.

"And in all vineyards shall be wailing : for I will pass through thee, saith the Lord."

iv. 5a.

"And offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving with leaven, and proclaim and publish the free offerings."

v. 21b.

"I will not smell in your solemn assemblies."

GENESIS xix. 24, 25.

"Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire. And he overthrew those cities."

EXODUS xii. 29.

"And it came to pass that at midnight the Lord smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt."

xii. 12.

"For I will pass through the land of Egypt this night, and will smite all the first-born of the land of Egypt, both man and beast."

LEVITICUS vii. 13 :

"He shall offer for his offering leavened bread with the sacrifice of thanksgiving." xxii. 18. 21 : "And for all his free-will offerings."

xxvi. 31.

"I will not smell the savour of your sweet odours."

AMOS ii. 11.

NUMBERS.

“And I raised up of your sons for prophets, and of your young men for Nazarites.”

Compare vi. 2, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21, where the order is first instituted, although some might refer to Judg. xiii. 5, 7, xvi. 17.

ix. 12.

xxiv. 18.

“That they may possess the remnant of Edom.”

“And Edom shall be a possession.”

v. 11b.

DEUTERONOMY xxviii. 30.

“Ye have built houses of hewn stone, but ye shall not dwell in them; ye have planted pleasant vineyards, but ye shall not drink the wine of them.”

“Thou shalt build a house, and thou shalt not dwell therein: thou shalt plant a vineyard, and shalt not gather the grapes thereof.” Compare ver. 39.

Equally striking with the use of the word Thorah by the above prophets is its use by Zephaniah and Ezekiel. No fair-minded person, who regards the passages in their connection, can claim that either of these prophets means his own teaching or that of any other prophet, unless it be Moses. Zephaniah, iii. 45, says: “Her priests have polluted the sanctuary; they have done violence to the law” (Thorah). For the same reason, Ezekiel, in the following words, does not indicate merely the teaching of prophets or priests, but rather an established code:

EZEKIEL xxii. 26.

LEVITICUS xxii. 2:

“Her priests have violated my law (Thorah), and have profaned mine holy things: they have put themselves from the holy things of no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they shewed difference between the

“Speak unto Aaron and to his sons, that they separate themselves from the holy things of the children of Israel, and that they profane not my holy name in those things which they hallow

unclean and the clean, and have unto me: I am the Lord." x. 10: hid their eyes from my Sabbaths, "And that ye may put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean."

It seems to us, then, that it is more than probable that in all these cases the prophets refer to a work which may well have been co-extensive with our present Pentateuch. To deny this possibility, in our opinion, savours of dogmatism.

A P P E N D I X I I I.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF ISAIAH XL.—LXVI.

THE one strong point which the critics¹ have made against Isaiah's being the author of chapters xl.—lxvi. has been clearly stated by Prof. Smith as his own:² "There is no reason to think a prophet ever received a revelation which was not spoken directly and pointedly to his own time; . . . when the principle is admitted, other applications follow, mainly in the Book of Isaiah, where the anonymous chapters xl.—lxvi. cannot be understood in a natural and living way except by looking at them from the historical standpoint of the exile." To us this seems to be the one strong point; for the peculiarity of the style of this portion,³ which distinguishes it from other parts of Isaiah's prophecies, is not inconsistent with his being the author of it. It is well known that style

¹ *E.g.* De Wette, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung*, etc., Berlin 1869, S. 413, says: "Es ist gegen alle Analogie, dass Jesaiah nicht bloss soll das Exil geweissagt (wie etwa xxxix. 6 ff.; 2 Kön. xx. 17 ff., wiewohl so bestimmte, ausser dem Gesichtskreise liegende Vorhersagungen ebenfalls gegen die Analogie sind) sondern im Exile selbst seinen Standpunkt genommen haben."

² In the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9th ed., art. "Bible," p. 640.

³ For a list of these peculiarities, see De Wette, *ibid.* S. 412.

greatly varies with the same person at different periods of his life, and according to the subject which he has in hand.¹ Besides, there are such resemblances between the prophecy contained in Isa. xl.—lxvi. and the other portions which are attributed to him, that even De Wette admits that this similarity must be the result of imitation or of some other cause which he does not assign.² Indeed, the style in these chapters resembles that of the so-called genuine Isaiah beyond that of any other prophet, who, in the evening of life, as the last rays were gilding his horizon, clearly saw the future woes and deliverances of his people, and that light which was to lighten the Gentiles.

The question will doubtless be raised, whether we have any proof that a prophet from the foreseen captivity of a people can behold their deliverance. Taking scientific proof in the sense which we have already defined, we must admit that we have none. But this kind of proof is not adequate for the discussion of some subjects, of which this is one. Here we

¹ For good illustrations of marked differences in style in the same authors, compare *Deuteronomy the People's Book*, pp. 241–249.

² *Einleitung*, S. 412 f.: “Manches ist allerdings diesen Capp. mit den achtten Stücken gemein, z. B. קָדוֹשׁ טָרָא, fast in allen Capp. und sonst nur Ps. lxxi. 22, lxxxviii. 41, lxxxix. 19; Jer. 1. 29, li. 5 (vgl. Hos. xi. 9, xii. 11); die Figur iv. 3, ix. 5, xix. 18, xxx. 7, xxxv. 8, xliv. 5, xlvi. 1, 4, 5, lvi. 7, lx. 14, lxi. 3, lxii. 4 (vgl. jedoch Hos. i. 10; Sach. viii. 3); Jahn, S. 459 f.; Möller, p. 59 seqq.—Mehreres, was diese noch anführen, beweist nichts; jenes aber kann nicht bloss Zufällig sein, und muss aus Nachahmung lxv. 25 ist aus xi. 9 entlehnt oder sonst wie erklärt werden.” For other examples of favourite expressions which run through the entire book, see Delitzsch, *Biblischer Commentar über den Propheten Jesaiah*, Leipzig 1869, S. 411.

have other proofs. Although, strictly speaking, they are not scientific, and we are not ashamed to make the admission, yet they are to our minds sufficient.

(1.) That, according to the sacred writers, the prophets did not merely have reference to the men of their own time, appears from the words of Peter:¹ “Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you; searching what or what manner of time the spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven.” Certainly Peter, as well as Philip in his address to the Ethiopian eunuch,² must have considered that Isa. liii. 2–12 was intended for a distant future, in which, as has been well said,³ “the suffering and the exaltation of Christ are as clearly proclaimed as though the prophet, like an evangelist, stood under the cross, and as if he had seen the crucified One.” The prophet, however, does not stop here, but from that distant future “takes his standpoint between the sufferings and the glorification of the Messiah. The sufferings appear to him as past, the glory he represents as future.”⁴

¹ 1 Pet. i. 10–12.

² Acts viii. 30–35.

³ See Delitzsch, *Bibl. Commentar über den Propheten Jesaia*, S. 408.

⁴ Hengstenberg, *Christol. des alten Test.*, Berlin 1855, B. ii. S. 197.

(2.) The germs of such prophecy appear in Leviticus and Deuteronomy. We are aware that the critics of the negative school will at once deny us the use of the passages which we are about to quote, as belonging to a much later date than that to which they are assigned. One of the main reasons for denying the Mosaic authorship of these chapters is that assigned in the canon of criticism already quoted. We have proved that Ezekiel quotes from the twenty-sixth chapter of Leviticus. We could also afford proof of the same fact with regard to Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the older prophets. We are satisfied that equally conclusive proof could be adduced in regard to quotations by the oldest prophets from the prophetic chapters of Deuteronomy xxviii.—xxx., to say nothing of the rest of the book. In these chapters, Moses prophesies in regard to the destruction of the cities of Israel, the desolation of their sanctuaries, their captivity, and God's favour to them in case of their repentance. While these prophecies may be said to apply to Moses' immediate hearers, their more express application is found at a much later period, and the author takes his standpoint in the distant future. Prof. Delitzsch has very happily characterized the relation of these chapters to later prophecy as the same as that of the Decalogue to all laws, and the Lord's Prayer to all prayer, and their style of treatment as that which is repeated in subsequent prophecies, namely, the history of the people from beginning to end, in which four periods are developed: "Israel's creation and

elevation; Israel's unthankfulness and apostasy; Israel's abandonment to the heathen; finally, the restoration of the purified though not destroyed Israel.”¹ The stand-point of the testamentary song is the time which is indicated by **נָאָתָה** in Deut. xxxii. 20.

(3.) The prophecies of Isaiah, especially those which are contained in chapters xl.-lxvi., through the embodiment of these elements receive a far-reaching and universal character. Even in the first chapter, which the critics acknowledge as genuine, we may trace the four elements above mentioned. In the disputed chapters the restoration of Israel is painted in the brightest colours on the background of the exile.² Of course, if we admit the validity of Professor Smith's canon, that the prophet's revelation was spoken directly and pointedly to his own time, we must conclude that the author wrote in the exile. When, however, we examine the nature of these prophecies, and see that much was promised to ancient Israel which has not yet been fulfilled, we must consider the prophecy as something far more than a comforting discourse which was addressed to a prophet's contemporaries during the exile. If we were to hold this, we must suppose that the prophet was really greatly mistaken, since he connected such glorious expectations with the end of the exile. If, however, we assume that since Isaiah's prophecies with reference to Babylon and the sufferings of Christ have been almost literally fulfilled, the

¹ *Bibl. Commentar über den Propheten Jesaia*, 1869, S. 33.

² *E.g.* Isa. xlix. 13-23, liv. 1-10, lx.-lxii., lxvi. 20-24.

others, which have never been accomplished, await their fulfilment, we obtain a view of the universality and apocalyptic nature of his prophecies, which diminishes the probability that their main object was the consolation of a captive people.

(4.) It has been abundantly shown by Caspary that Zephaniah had read Isaiah xl.—lxvi.¹ It also seems clear to us, from the following comparison of passages, that Jeremiah has had access to these chapters of Isaiah, from which he frequently quotes, as well as from the preceding chapters :

JEREMIAH x. 3-5.

ISAIAH xliv. 9a:

“ For the customs of the people are vain : for one cutteth a tree out of the forest, the work of the hands of the workman, with the axe. They deck it with silver and with gold ; they fasten it with nails and with hammers, that it move not ; they must needs be borne, because they cannot go. Be not afraid of them, for they cannot do evil ; neither also is it in them to do good.”

“ They that make a graven image are all of them vanity. Ver. 14 : He heweth him down cedar, and taketh the cypress and the oak. Ver. 13 : The carpenter stretcheth out his rule ; he marketh out with a line ; he fitteth it with planes. xl. 19 : The workman melteth a graven image, and the goldsmith spreadeth it over with gold, and casteth silver chains. xli. 7b : And he fastened it with nails that it should not be moved. xlvi. 7 : They bear him upon the shoulder, they carry him and set him in his place. xli. 23 : Do good or do evil, that we may be dismayed, and behold it together.”

¹ Rudelbach (now Delitzsch) und Guerike, *Zeitschrift für die gesammte Lutherische Theologie*, Leipzig 1843, Band iv. Heft 2, S. 66-73.

JEREMIAH xxx. 10, xlvi. 27, 28.

“Therefore fear thou not, O my servant Jacob.”

l. 38a, li. 36b.

ISAIAH xliv. 2.

“Fear not, Jacob, my servant.”

xliv. 27.

“A drought is upon her waters, and they shall be dried up. . . . dry, and I will dry up thy And I will dry up her sea, and rivers.” make her springs dry.”

xxvii. 5.

xlv. 12.

“I have made the earth.”

“I have made the earth.”

xlviii. 18.

xlvii. 1.

“Thou daughter that dost inhabit Dibon, come down from thy glory, and sit in thirst.”

l. 8.

“Come down, and sit in the dust, O virgin daughter of Babylon, sit on the ground.”

xlviii. 20.

“Remove out of the midst of Babylon, and go forth out of the land of the Chaldeans.”

xii. 9b.

lvi. 9.

“Come ye, assemble all the beasts of the field, come to devour.”

עֲבָדֵי יַעֲקֹב.

“All ye beasts of the field, come to devour.”

Jer. xxx. 10, xlvi. 27, 28.

xli. 8, 9, xlvi. 19, xlvi. 1, 21,

xlvi. 4, xlvi. 20.

(5.) The entire Book of Isaiah, whether in the original or in the English translation, has been considered by men of all classes as a rhetorical masterpiece. From a literary point of view, it occupies as high a position to every unprejudiced mind, with reference to the other books of the Old Testament, as that which Milton's *Paradise Lost* and Dante's *Divine Comedy* do to other poems. It is perhaps unexampled that one author should enter so completely into the spirit of the most eloquent of the prophets at a remove of 150 years,—that he

should be able to reproduce his style with not inferior, indeed with much greater eloquence, so that he is like a risen and glorified Isaiah. Besides, it is highly improbable that a prophet living in the time of the exile, who presented such hopes to the people, should have been unknown and forgotten by them,¹ while the names of a less esteemed Jeremiah and Ezekiel² have been preserved.

¹ In the *Pesikta* of Rab Kahana, ed. Buber, Lyck 1868, f. 125b, Isaiah receives the divine testimony: “By thy life! all the prophets prophesy the one out of the mouth of the other (נְבִיא, נְבִיא, מִפְּנֵי נְבִיא, . . . but thou prophesiest out of the mouth of the Majesty (מִפְּנֵי הַנְּבוֹרָה).”

² The following interesting comparison is instituted, in *Chajigah* 13b, between Isaiah and Ezekiel with reference to the style of their prophecies: “Rabba said, Isaiah saw everything that Ezekiel saw. Ezekiel is like a villager who has seen the king, but Isaiah is like a man from the city who has seen him.”

APPENDIX IV.

הכהנים הלוים THE TEXT OF

THE Talmud in the Palestinian, as well as the Babylonian Gemara, mentions that there are twenty-four places in the Old Testament where the priests are called Levites.¹

It is evident from this, and from the enumeration of the Massora,² that *vav* might have been wanting in five more passages of the text of the Old Testament, as known to Rabbi Joshua ben-Levi, than in the later copies.³

¹ In *Jebamoth*, 86b; *Bechoroth*, 4a; *Chullin*, 24b; *Tamid*, 61a; and in the Jerusalem Gemara, *Sota* vii. 4, it is written in regard to Ezek. xlii. 15: "But the priests the Levites, the sons of Zadok," etc.; "Rabbi Joshua, the son of Levi (250 A.D.), says: In twenty-four places the priests are called Levites, and this is one of them."

² The Massora, which was collated for us by Dr. S. Baer from codices Nos. 1-3 of the Erfurt Library (for a description of these MSS. see Paul de Lagarde's *Symmicta*, Goettingen 1877, S. 129-164), enumerates only the nineteen passages, which we had already found, as follows—^{וְגַם הַכֹּהנִים הַלוּיִם}—in thirteen passages: Deut. xvii. 9, 18, xxiv. 8; Josh. viii. 33; Ezek. xlivi. 19; Ezra x. 5; Neh. x. 29, 35, xi. 20; 1 Chron. ix. 2; 2 Chron. v. 5, xxiii. 18, xxx. 27. ^{וְהַכֹּהנִים הַלוּיִם}—thrice: Deut. xxvii. 9; Josh. iii. 3; Ezek. xliv. 15. ^{לְכֹהנִים הַלוּיִם}—once: (לִית דְסִמֵּךְ) Deut. xviii. 1. ^{לְכֹהנִים הַלוּיִם}—once: (לִית דְסִמֵּךְ) Jer. xxxiii. 18. ^{לְכֹהנִים הַלוּיִם}—once: Isa. lxvi. 21.

³ See the Note I. to this Appendix, p. 227.

We were first moved to a critical examination of the text, by Graf's sweeping statement that the expression "priests Levites" does not occur in *Chronicles*¹ (including *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*). As we found a number of such passages, we were surprised, and at first thought it possible that Graf might have rejected them for critical reasons, without apprising his readers of the fact. We found in the collations given in Kennicott's² *Bible* that some Hebrew mss. inserted a *rav* in one or more of these passages, while the great majority of mss., in every case except that of *Isa. lxvi. 21*, sustained the received reading, without *rav*; hence the examination of the state of the text seemed worthy of special attention. We believe the citations given by Kennicott are substantially correct. We were glad, however, to see the passages with our own eyes, in which we were much assisted by Dr. S. M. Schiller-Szinessy, of the University Library, Cambridge, and Mr. Adolph Neubauer, of the Bodleian Library, Oxford; the latter afterwards sent us information in regard to some mss. which we had not time to see. We ourselves examined *Isa. lxvi. 21* in fourteen mss.³ of the British Museum without finding any variation, and the

¹ Graf, *Die Geschichtl. Bücher d. A. T.*, Leipzig 1866, S. 46. See pp. 114-15.

² *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum, cum variis lectionibus*, Oxonii 1776-80; De Rossi in his *Variae Lectiones V. T.*, Parmae 1784-86, mentions only three of the eighteen passages where variations occur: *Josh. iii. 3*; *Isa. lxvi. 21*; *2 Chron. v. 5*.

³ Harleian, 1528, 5498, 5711, 5720, 5722, 5774; King's, 1; additional, 4708, 9398, 9399, 11657, 15252, 21161, 27046.

nineteen passages in thirty-three mss. of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, besides a part of these passages in seven mss. mostly of the Pentateuch. Monsieur H. Zotenberg very kindly furnished us information in regard to five Samaritan Pentateuchs, which afford no variations, and the Syriac version of James of Edessa (beginning of the eighth century), which varies from our printed versions of the Peschito in two places.

It was our purpose to verify all Kennicott's readings as far as possible. To this end we addressed letters to all the libraries on the Continent, where the mss. which he mentions in connection with the nineteen passages are to be found. Owing to the lateness of the season, most of the libraries were closed;¹ still the librarian of the Hamburg library very kindly arranged to have a collation made for us there. We also received the readings of the Reuchlin mss. and the Soncino Bible at Carlsruhe, through the great courtesy of Messrs. Director W. Brambach and Dr. F. Teufel, and readings from the Royal and University Library at Königsberg, through Professor Dr. Simson and Director Dr. Reicke. A complete collation of the Hebrew mss. and the Brescia Bible in Berlin was arranged for us by Dr. Moritz Steinschneider. R. Ruetschi, D.D., of Berne, Professor Dr. Holzammer of Mayence, and Dr. Fausto Lasinio of Florence, each very kindly verified one reading; Director Bruun, of the

¹ Of Kennicott's 207 variations we have verified 72, have secured the verification of 38 of De Rossi's variations, and have added 58 new readings.

Royal Library, Copenhagen, five ; and Director Ceriani, of the Ambrosian Library, Milan, eight others, besides his collation of the passages from the ancient Syriac ms.

Our application to the library at Parma, in regard to De Rossi's readings, was very promptly and handsomely acknowledged by Signore Cav. Pietro Perreau, who verified thirty-eight of De Rossi's readings in the three passages which he mentions. Professor Dr. H. Oort, of Leyden, furnished us information in regard to the mss. there. In only two instances have we found Kennicott at fault. Bruns, however, has overlooked many passages.

It may be thought a waste of time to pursue this subject thus minutely, but we have seen in the past discussion how much depends on the presence or absence of a *vav*. If the connective could be proved to have existed in the most ancient mss. of Deuteronomy in the passages in question, this would be of no small importance in discussing the relation of Deuteronomy to the middle books of the Pentateuch. Hence it is that a minute scientific examination is not only justified, but also imperatively necessary.

There is, however, a great obstacle in the way of any satisfactory conclusion, and that is our ignorance in regard to the time and manner in which the Massora originated. Its authority is generally regarded as decisive as to the adoption or rejection of readings. There is no question, however, that modern science should devote itself as assiduously to the text of

the Old Testament as to that of the New. To consider the text of the Old Testament as settled, when such rich materials for the history of that text exist, is a great mistake.¹

Nevertheless we shall yield to the authority of the Massora, even where the oldest mss. and all the versions agree against the ordinary text, because we consider it safer to accept the received opinion on such matters, until the superior authority of the deviating mss. has been proved beyond the shadow of a doubt. It may be considered significant that so few mss. support the variations in the passages in Deuteronomy. But this is not strange, when we remember the peculiar reverence in which the Pentateuch has been held by the Jews. Yet it is possible that during an ante-Massoretic period the same phenomena might have been noticed in these passages, in many of the Thorah rolls, as now appear in the older mss. of Isaiah and Chronicles. This certainly should not be forgotten by the critics.

In the list of passages, which we shall give, a mere enumeration of mss. where הַלְּיָם instead of הַלְּיָם occurs would be of no service in determining the original state of the text, unless we were to consider how they have probably arisen, and the character of the mss. in which they occur.

Our own examination has led us to the following

¹ Compare Dillmann's excellent article on the "Bibeltext des A. T.," in Herzog's and Plitt's *Real-Encyclopädie*, B. ii., Leipzig 1877, S. 381-400.

conclusions:—(1.) That the work of the first hand, who simply transcribed the letters without points and accents, was often as mechanical as that of the type-setter; hence the insertion or omission of a *vav* might be in consequence of a mistake. (2.) The second hand (the נקדן, punctuator, or מגינה, corrector) brought all the intelligence of a skilled proof-reader, striking out this and inserting that as the case might be. Perhaps the first hand, through lack of critical ability, in mechanically following a more ancient ms., has preserved a reading which, although not the Massoretic, is still not erroneous.

The character of mss. does not depend upon the country where they were produced, but upon their age, which is to be determined from the material upon which they are written, the character of the writing, and from epigraphs. The common opinion, that the Spanish mss. should be preferred to others, is not correct. The celebrated Massorites¹ and punctuators are distributed throughout all lands. In Europe, the most celebrated punctuators did not live in Spain, but in France, Germany, and England. Two celebrated punctuators, who were natives of England, are Moses ha-Nakdan, from London (מלונדן), and Mose ben-Isaak ben-Hanesiah, from England (טמזרה אינגלטרא).² Although

¹ The most distinguished of the Massorites were Aaron and Moses ben-Asher, whose mss. are in Aleppo and in the Karaite synagogue at Cairo.

² See Zunz, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur*, Berlin 1845, S. 111 seq.

the character of the quadrate writing differs according to the time and country, it is essentially the same.

In making our collation, we shall give the readings of the Septuaginta,¹ the Targums, and Jerome.² We leave the printed version of the Peshito entirely out of account, since it inserts a connective in every case,³ namely ○, *and*, except in Deut. xvii. 9, which has the conjunction ○], *or*. It is not probable that the text of the LXX. and of Jerome exactly corresponds to the Hebrew original. They have evidently in some cases inserted a connective, because it seemed to them that the sense allowed it. The text of the Targums, also, cannot be quoted as conclusive when they insert a connective, since they not only translate, but also interpret and paraphrase the Hebrew text in a traditional and harmonistic way.⁴ Moreover, we have cursorily noticed in the mss. of Onkelos

¹ According to the Alexandrian version, there are only ten of the nineteen passages given by the Massora without a connective: Deut. xvii. 9, 18; xviii. 1, xxiv. 8 (10); xxvii. 9; 1 Chron. ix. 2; xxx. 27; Neh. x. 29 (28); Ezek. xlivi. 19; xliv. 15.

² Jerome inserts a connective in all but the following seven passages: Deut. xvii. 9, 18; xxiv. 8; xxvii. 9; Josh. iii. 3; viii. 33; Neh. x. 29.

³ We refer here to the text as given by Walton and Lee, which in these passages agrees with the ancient Syriac ms. of the sixth century, in the Ambrosian Library, of which a photo-lithograph is now being prepared, entitled, *Translatio Syra Pescitio Veteris Testamenti*, . . . tom. i. pars i. Genesis—Job, I.—XXIV. Mediolani, 1876. See Nestle in Schürer's *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Leipzig 1876, 328—31.

⁴ Especially the two recensions of the Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch.

considerable variety in the insertion or omission of the *vav* in the passages in question.

In the following passages we shall briefly mention the characteristics of the MSS. as given by Kennicott,¹ and by the authors of the valuable catalogues of the Cambridge,² Paris,³ Hamburg,⁴ and Copenhagen⁵ libraries.

DEUTERONOMY xvii. 9.

“And thou shalt come unto the priests the Levites.”

The LXX., the Samaritans,⁶ Onkelos, the Jerusalem

¹ *Dissertatio Generalis in V. T. Hebr., cum variis lectionibus, ex codicibus, mss., et impressis*, Oxonii 1780.

² *Catalogue of the Hebrew mss. preserved in the University Library, Cambridge*, by Dr. S. M. Schiller-Szinessy, vol. i., Cambridge 1876.

³ *Catalogues des Manuscrits Hébreux et Samaritains de la Bibliothèque Impériale*, Paris 1866.

⁴ The catalogue of the Hebrew MSS. in the Hamburg library, of which Dr. Steinschneider very kindly furnished me the proof-sheets, is promised to the public in 1878. The catalogue of the Hebrew MSS. of the Bodleian Library, by Mr. Adolph Neubauer, is still in press. It is very much to be lamented that the authorities of the British Museum, who have made such munificent provision in other respects, should neither have secured a curator nor an adequate catalogue for their admirable collection of Hebrew MSS.

⁵ *Codices Hebraici et Arabici Bibliothecae Regiae Hafniensis*, Hafniae 1851.

⁶ This is according to Kennicott's text of the Samaritan Pentateuch, which is based on the collation of sixteen MSS. (Kenn. 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, and 66, which are in the Bodleian Library; 127, British Museum; 183, Leyden; 197, Ambrosian Library, Milan; 221 [B. N. 3], 333 [B. N. 5], 363 [B. N. 2], 364 [B. N. 4], Paris; 503, Vatican Library; 504, Barberian Library, Rome). The readings in four of the Paris MSS. have been verified by Monsieur Zotenberg, who has also added two from a more recent acquisition.

Targum, and Jerome, translate without a connective. The reading **הכהנים והלויים** occurs in the following MSS.:—

Kenn. 4*,¹ *Neub.* 16, Bodleian. A German MS. containing many readings, some of which are very good.

Kenn. 69*, Corpus Christi, Oxford v. (B. 4, 7). This MS., which is written from left to right, according to the Latin translation, is of no critical value.

Neub. 21, Bodleian. A German MS., containing the Pentateuch with Onkelos and Rashi, the Haphtaroth, and the five Megilloth,² which was bought A.D. 1368.

These readings with *vav* cannot be considered as resting on any critical ground.

DEUTERONOMY xvii. 18.

“And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write himself a duplicate of this law in a book from before the priests the Levites.”

The LXX, Onkelos,³ the Samaritans, the Jerusalem Targum, and Jerome, have no connective.

[B. N. 12]. Although the text of the Samaritan Targum, which is that of Walton, needs to be critically established (compare Samuel Kohn, *Zur Sprache, Literatur und Dogmatik der Samaritaner*, Leipzig 1877), yet there is no doubt that the Samaritan here, as well as in the following passages, had no connective.

¹ The star indicates the MSS. which we have examined ourselves.

² This and all subsequent descriptions, where the MSS. of the Bodleian Library have not been given by Kennicott, have been taken from the advanced sheets of Neubauer's catalogue.

³ The following variations occur in the Targum of Onkelos to xvii. 18, **בְּהַנִּיא וְלִיאִ**: British Museum *Add.* 26878, Pent. with Onk. (pointed), the five Meg., and Hapht., with Rashi's Commentary; B. N., Paris 39. See under Isa. lxvi. 21. The *vav* has a sign of

The reading **הכהנים והלוים** occurs in the following MSS. :—

Neub. 16 (Kenn. 4, which he has overlooked). The Bible in German Hebrew characters. According to Kennicott, it was written in the 11–12 century,¹ and contains not a few good readings.

Kenn. 69*. See under ver. 9.

Kenn. 196. Ambrosian Library, E 86. The Pentateuch with Targum, Megill., Haph., Job, and Jeremiah. The ms. is defective.

Neub. 21. See under ver. 9.

Cambridge 17* (S.S.). The Pentateuch with Onkelos, the Megilloth, the Haphtaroth, Job, and some passages from Jeremiah in Franco-German Hebrew characters. “The text offers, except positive mistakes, no various readings.” 13–14 century.

There is certainly in these MSS. not the slightest warrant for a change in the reading.

DEUTERONOMY xviii. 1.

“ The priests the Levites, all the tribe of Levi, shall have no part nor inheritance with Israel.”

The LXX., the Samaritans, Onkelos,² the Jerusalem

erasure. Also in a manuscript of the 14th cent., Hamburg library, *Steinsch.* 15, Pent. with Onk. after every verse, Meg., Hapht., Job, A.D. 1486.

¹ Neubauer, in his new catalogue, does not attempt to assign any age to MSS. which have no epigraph.

² B. N., Paris 39, has **ולויִנִי** (with the sign of erasure); also *Steinsch.* 1, Hamburg, Pent., Meg., Hapht., Job, with the greater and lesser Massora. German ms. of the fourteenth (?) century.

Targum, and the Syriac version of James of Edessa, have no connective. Jerome inserts *et*. The reading לכהנים והלויים is only supported by the worthless ms. Kenn. 69, where, moreover, the *vav* has a sign of erasure.

DEUTERONOMY xxiv. 8.

“Take heed in the plague of leprosy that thou observe diligently, and do according to all that the priests the Levites shall teach you.”

The LXX., Onkelos,¹ the Jerusalem Targum, and Jerome, have no *vav*. The reading הכהנים והלויים occurs as follows:—

Kenn. 69*. See Deut. xvii. 9.

Kenn. 84 (Neub. 2325). Gen. xxxiii. 7—Judg. xx. 47; 1 Sam. iii. 17—2 Sam. xxiv. 15; Jer. xi. 10 to end. A German ms., which, according to Kennicott, was written A.D. 1136, and contains many readings that conform to the Samaritan and the ancient versions.

Kenn. 181. Pentateuch, with Targum, Megilloth, and Haphtaroth. “This Helmstedt codex was copied from a ms. which had not been emended according to the rules of the Massorites.” He assigns it to the thirteenth century.

It is highly improbable that the reading with *vav* in these two last mss. rests on good authority.

DEUTERONOMY xxvii. 9a.

“And Moses and the priests the Levites spake unto all Israel.”

¹ B. N., Paris 39, has נליין.

The LXX., the Samaritans, Onkelos, the Jerusalem Targum, Jerome, and the Syriac version of James of Edessa, have no connective.

The reading **והכהנים והלויים** is found in the following MSS. :—

*Kenn. 193^v.*¹ Ambrosian Library, G. 2, A.D. 1287. The Pentateuch in German writing, without points and Massora.

*Kenn. 206** (B. N. 5–6), A.D. 1298. German MS., with Massora, which contains in vol. i. the Pentateuch with Onkelos, the five Megilloth, the Haphtaroth, and in vol. ii. the rest of O. T. The *rav* has a sign of erasure.

*Neub. 16** (Kenn. 4, by a mistake he has quoted No. 1), 11–12 cent. See under Deut. xvii. 9.

Kenn. 9 (Neub. 40), 12–13 cent. A rabbinical MS. of the Pentateuch, without Massora and points. It has very many variations. The *rav* has been erased.

Kenn. 144 (13–14 cent.). A Bible MS. which is written in rabbinical characters, and once belonged to Sampson Simson of New York. The *rav* has been erased.

Kenn. 103, B. M., Harl. 5498, A.D. 14 cent. Bible MS. The *rav* has a sign of erasure.

Hamburg, 15^v (Steinsch.), A.D. 1486. See Deut. xvii. 18; Remark 3, pp. 198, 199.

While the reading with the connective² has more support here than in the preceding passages, it is still far from being sufficient.

¹ The letter *v* indicates those readings which have been verified.

² Rashi's MS. seems to have read **והכהנים והלויים**, as this is the only passage where he inserts a connective.

JOSHUA iii. 3.

“ And they commanded the people, saying, When ye see the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, and the priests the Levites bearing it, then ye shall remove from your place and go after it.”

The LXX. and the Targum have the connective, but Jerome follows the usual reading.

The reading **והכהנים והלויים** in the following MSS. :—

Kenn. 1^{**} (Neub. 8-9), 9-10 cent. A.D. (De Rossi, 12 cent.). Spanish Bible MS. with both Massoras. Kennicott assigns this great age to this MS.—(1) because it agrees with the Samaritan version in 700 cases where it deviates from the ordinary Hebrew text; (2) because it contains 14,000 variations from the text of Van der Hooght, many of which exist only in the more ancient MSS.; (3) because it was originally without Massora, which, according to Jablonski, is a sure sign that a MS. ancient in other respects is very ancient.

Kenn. 225, Vatican Library, Urbin. 2, A.D. 12 cent. Bible in intermediate (Spanish-German) characters, with Massora. The date of the epigraph, 979 A.D., was suspected by Assemani, and rejected by Bruns, because it was written by a later hand.

De Rossi, 226 (Parma), 12-13 cent. A.D. German. The prophets without Massora and *keri*. This codex is of great value and antiquity. The *vav* has a sign of erasure.

Hamburg, 3^v (Kenn. 616), 12 cent. (Bruns and

Lichtenstein.) Steinsch. doubts it. Prophets. The reading with *vav* is not mentioned by Bruns.

Kenn. 198^v, Nuremberg 1, A.D. 1291. The Old Testament. Ruth and Esther precede the Psalms; and Job, with the rest of the Megilloth, precedes Proverbs. The Targum accompanies all the books until Proverbs.

Kenn. 174^v, Copenhagen 17, A.D. 1346. Former Prophets. The *keri* is very often found in the text.

De Rossi (Parma), 1^v, A.D. 13 cent. German Bible, ms., with Hapt., and in the Prophets the greater Massorah. In the Hagiographa there is none except the *keri*, which also occurs very rarely in the Pentateuch. “*Codex in quo praestantissimae variae lectiones occurunt*.”

Kenn. 475, A.D. 14 cent. Prophets, Hagiographa. The reading with *vav*, which has the sign of erasure, is not given by Kennicott, but was found by De Rossi.

Kenn. 187^v, Ambrosian Library, Milan, B. 56, A.D. 13 cent. German ms. Former Prophets and Meg., Jer., Is., defective.

De Rossi, 305^v (Parma), 13–14 cent. A.D. Prophets with both Massoras. “*Praestantissimus codex*.” The *vav* has been erased.

De Rossi, 187^v (Parma), A.D. 1473. Spanish Bible with Massora. The *vav* has two little lines above it, showing that it should be removed.

Cambridge, 15^{*} (S.S.), 14–15 cent. A.D. The Bible with Massora in German characters.

B. N., Paris, 1314–15^{*}. Zotenberg does not consider the epigraph genuine, and assigns it to the

thirteenth century.¹ The Bible in two volumes, with Massora and some miniatures. It was presented to the library by the Empress Eugenie in 1869. *The rāv has been added by a later hand.*

De Rossi, “Prophetae priores, . . . cum Commentario Kimchi, fol. Soncini anno ab orbe condito ၏.ccxlv., Christi mcccclxxxv.” *Annales Hebr.-Typograph.*, sec. xv., Parmae 1795, p. 40.

Carlsruhe, De 50^v. The Soncino Bible, 1488. The *keri* often stands in the text. It affords, according to De Rossi, not a few valuable readings.

Berlin 5–7 (*Kenn.* 607, reading not given by him). Old German Bible, ms., in large square characters. It was bought by the Bishop of Brandenburg in England, 1437.

The Brescia Bible, Berlin 1494, which is famous as having been used by Luther. But he translates the above passage: “Die Priester aus den Leviten.”

De Rossi, 4^v (Parma), 1496 A.D. Spanish Bible ms.

It is remarkable that the LXX., the Targum, and so many good mss., should agree in inserting the connective. Still we cannot be certain that the LXX. and the Targum represent anything more than an exegetical opinion; and we know that Rashi († 1105) read priests Levites,² hence his authority might be

¹ See Notes to Appendix iv. 2.

² He remarks on the *כהנים הליים* in Josh. iii. 3: “Because they came from Levi, the father of Amram, they are called Levites, as our Rabbis have explained in Bereshith Rabba that in forty-five places the priests are called Levites.” This statement can never have had any foundation in fact. See the foot of p. 231.

considered as at least partially counterbalancing that of the Hebrew mss. Besides, there seems to be no consistency in the scribes inserting the connective here, while they omit it in Josh. viii. 33. Still the authorities quoted are well worthy of the attention of the critics, especially as illustrating how a *vav* may fall out or be inserted in mooted passages.

JOSHUA viii. 33.

“And all Israel, and their elders, and officers, and their judges, stood on this side the ark and on that side before the priests the Levites,” etc.

The LXX. inserts *καὶ*, the Targum agrees with the ordinary Hebrew text, while Jerome makes no mention of the Levites. The reading **הכהנים והלויים** occurs in the following mss. :—

Kenn. 180^v, Hamburg 16, A.D. 12 cent. (Steinschn.?). Prophets and Hagiographa, with triple Massora. The deviations from the text have been mostly corrected.

Kenn. 174, Copenhagen, A.D. 1346. See under Josh. iii. 3.

Kenn. 375^v, Mayence, *Bib. Jes.*, 13 cent. Former Prophets with Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The Massora is wanting.

Cambridge, 15* (S.S.), 14–15 cent. See under Josh. iii. 3.

ISAIAH lxvi. 21.

“And I will also take of them for priests and for Levites, saith the Lord.”

The LXX., Jerome, and the Targum insert the connective. The following mss. have וְלֹא יִמְלֹא, which we give according to their age:—

No. B. 3, Imperial Public Library, St. Petersburg, 916 A.D. Later Prophets, with Massora. It contains many important variations.¹ The *vav* of וְלֹא יִמְלֹא is marked with a sign of erasure.

Kenn. 154*, Carlsruhe 1, Public Library, 1106 A.D. Former and latter Prophets with the Targum.² It was once the property of Reuchlin. Its various readings, of which Bruns has collated more than 6000, are so many, that, according to Kennicott, it affords an invincible argument that the copies of Hebrew Bibles in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries differed *very much from our printed text*.

Kenn. 531, Bologna 7, A.D. 1193. Prophets and Hagiographa. Kennicott gives no further information about this ancient ms.

Kenn. 342*, B. N., Paris 27, 1295 A.D. This rabbinical Bible ms. is without Massora, and affords many variations.

Kenn. 206*, B. N., Paris 5-6, A.D. 1298. See p. 201. The *vav* in Isa. lxvi. 21 has the sign of erasure.

Kenn. 136, A.D. 1299. Pentateuch, with Targum, Megilloth, and Haphtaroth, in Spanish-German characters.

¹ See *Catalog der Hebr. Bibelhandschr.*, St. Petersburg u. Leipzig 1875, S. 223-235.

² This Targum, with its marginal notes, but without points, has been published by Prof. Dr. Paul de Lagarde, *Prophetae Chaldaice*, Lipsiae 1872.

The following younger dated MSS. sustain the same reading:—*Kenn.* 486, Rome, Vatican Library, pal. 14, A.D. 1299; *Neub.* 23, Bodleian, and 593 Vienna, 1302 A.D.; *Kenn.* 367* and 368, Paris 38 and 86 (old number), 1303 A.D.; *De Rossi* 3 (*Kenn.* 574, private library, Venice), and Paris 8-10*, A.D. 1304 (*vav* has the sign of erasure); *Kenn.* 246, Turin 1 (old number), 1305 A.D.; *Kenn.* 251, Turin 6 (old number), 1310 A.D.; *Kenn.* 355, Paris 73, Orator. 41, 42, 43 (old number), 1314 A.D.; *Kenn.* 611*, Berlin Royal Library (in the Haphtaroth) 9, 1333 A.D.; *De Rossi* 20, A.D. 1335; *Kenn.* 588, Royal Library, 10, Vienna, A.D. 1341; *Kenn.* 524, Florence (private), A.D. 1351; *Kenn.* 421, Milan C. 149, A.D. 1356; *Kenn.* 390, University Library, Basel, A.D. 1402.

9-10 Cent. A.D.

Kenn. 1*, *Neub.* 8-9, Bodleian. For the description of this MS., see under *Josh.* iii. 3, p. 202.

Kenn. 590, Royal Library, 3, Vienna. This most excellent and ancient MS. contains the Prophets and the Hagiographa. The text is without Massora.

Kenn. 536, Cesena. 10-11 cent. A.D. This MS. is written in German characters without Massora, but cannot be found. See p. 231.

11-12 Cent. A.D.

Kenn. 201, Nuremberg 4. Prophets and Hagiographa. The Massora occurs very rarely.

Kenn. 220, B. N., Paris 80. Prophets and Hagiographa. This codex is written in rabbinical characters and without the great Massora.

Kenn. 225, Vatican Library, Urbin. 2. See the description of this ms. under *Josh.* iii. 3, p. 202.

Kenn. 366, B. N., Paris 86. The Prophets. The Books of Joshua and Judges are accompanied by Rashi's Commentary. This ms. is written in German characters.

De Rossi, 248^v. German ms. Pentateuch, with the Targum alternating with each verse, the five Megilloth, and the Haphtaroth. There is no vestige of the Massora, and not even of the *keri*, except in the testamentary Song of Moses.

De Rossi, 262^v. German Pentateuch, Megilloth, and without Haphtaroth. Massora, and scarcely any *keri*. The *matres lectionis* are frequent. There are many deviations from the ordinary text, and the readings agree with the Samaritan text and the ancient versions. These and other things, according to *De Rossi*, are proofs of the great age of the ms.

Kenn. 567, Venice, Cornelian Library, 1472 A.D.

De Rossi, 594^v (Parma), A.D. 1473. German Haphtaroth.

De Rossi, 892^v (Parma), A.D. 1484. Italian Pent., Meg., Haph.

Neub. 20, Bodleian, 1487 A.D. German Pent., Meg., Haph.

12-13 Cent. A.D.

Kenn. 17^v, *Neub.* 4, Bodleian. German ms. with vowel points and accents.

Kenn. 93, Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge,
Proph., Hagiogr.

„ 149^v, Berne Public Library, A. 92, Proph.

„ 212^{*}, B. N., Paris 39, with sign of erasure.

„ 248, Turin 13 (old number). Pent., Meg.,
Job, Haph.

„ 249, Turin 109 (old number). Bible ms.

„ 309^{*}, B. N., Paris 16, with a sign of erasure.

„ 335, B. N. 41, Paris. Pent. (with Targ.),
Meg., Hapht.

„ 369, Paris. German Pentateuch.

„ 526, Bologna 2 (old number). Spanish Proph.

„ 544, Modena, F. 8 (old number). Pent., Meg.,
Haph.

„ 584, Gradiasca, Proph., Meg., Haph.

B. N. 16^{*}, Paris (not given by Kenn. *Vav* with
the sign of erasure).

De Rossi, 419^v, 440^v, 507^v, 512^v, 555^v, 715^v, 825^v.

13–14 Cent. A.D.

Kenn. 150^v, Berlin 1–4. Ger. Bible with Massora.

„ 379, Mannheim (private). Pent., Hapht.,
Hagiogr.

„ 383. Royal Library, Munich, 2. Pent.,
Meg., Hapht., etc.¹

„ 446, Rome 36, Bib. Casant. 138. Deut.
(frag.), etc.

¹ See Steinschneider, *Die Hebr. Hss. d. k. Hof u. Staatsbibliothek, Munich, 1876*, S. 1.

Kenn. 467, Rome 57, Bib. Augustin. Angelic. 11.
 „ 468, Rome 58, *ibid.* 12. Psal. (frag.),
 Hapht., Meg.
 „ 487, Rome 76, Bib. Vatic. 26. Pent., Meg.,
 Hapht.
 „ 541, Modena H. 5. Royal Library, Bib. ms.
 „ 560, Padua, Benedictine Library. Bible ms.
 „ 575, Venice (Abr. Cracovia). Bible ms. has
 disappeared. See p. 230.
 „ 597, Monastery of Gottfried. Pent., Prov.,
 with Targ.
 „ 601, Erfurt 2 (private). Bible with Targ. in
 Pent.
 „ 603, Erfurt 4 (private). Pent. (with Targ.),
 Meg., Hapht.
 „ 607^v, Berlin Royal Library, 5–7, with sign
 of erasure.
 „ 608, Berlin 8. Pent. with Targ., Hapht.
 „ 618^v, Hamburg 15.
De Rossi, 1^v, 2^v, 305^v, 440^v, 594^v (549 v perhaps),
 606^v, 700^v.
Cambridge, 18^u, Pent., Meg., Hapht.

14–15 Cent. A.D.

Kenn. 95 and 96, Library of St. John the Evangelist, Cambridge.
 „ 108, Harl. 7621. Pent., Hapht., Meg.
 „ 646, Public Library, Leiden (the reading is
 doubtful).
De Rossi, 197^v, 883^v, 384^v.

Unestimated.

Neub. 7*, Bodleian. German square character.

We have then eighty-nine Hebrew MSS. which support the reading in Isa. lxvi. 21 of יְהִי. Still there are at least three times as many MSS. which have the reading without *vav*. On the other hand, the oldest MSS. support the reading with the connective. Under the circumstances, we have no right to claim that a *vav* did not stand in the copy of the MS. which was used by the Greek translator. It may be said that the translators might have inserted it here, as they seem to have done in other passages, because they thought the sense warranted it. But there is no proof of this. It is true that some of the oldest Greek MSS. insert *kai* in nine of the nineteen passages. Still it is quite likely that a *vav* stood in the text which was used by the translator. While we cannot be certain about the original text of the Targum, yet we have reason to suppose that the translation with *vav* is correct, and that it may represent another old MS. We have, besides, two very old MSS. which insert the connective,—the St. Petersburg, 916 A.D., and Reuchlin's MS., 1106 A.D. The first MS., with an epigraph which approaches in age, and omits the connective, is Kenn. 226, Rome 2, of the Vatican Library, which is dated 1140 A.D. But while the other MSS. are celebrated, we know nothing of the critical value of this codex. Besides these old MSS., whose date is fixed by the epigraphs, there are two others, which Kennicott

assigns to the 9–10 century. He has decided on the age of one of them, Kenn. 1, Neub. 8, 9, from his own investigations, and of the other, on the basis of Bruns'. Whatever may be thought of Kennicott's opinion,—and it seems to us that those who affect to despise it have much to do before they attain equal excellence in the criticism of the text,—the fact remains that no undated ms. which omits the *vav* seems to be of equal age and importance in Kennicott's estimation. Between the eleventh and twelfth centuries, there are, according to the age estimate by Kennicott, twelve mss. which omit the connective, not including the one which we have already mentioned. Between the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, there are forty-seven that omit *vav*, of dated and estimated mss.; and from the thirteenth to the fourteenth century, of undated mss., including some that are dated in the fifteenth century, there are seventy-one mss. If the oldest mss. omitted *vav*, we have no positive evidence of it. The Massora decided the question,—just on what grounds we cannot now determine. We find in No. 13 of the Cambridge Library, which Dr. Schiller-Szinessy assigns to the 12–13 century, a Massoretic note to the word in question in our passage לְמִנְחָה, that is, a (the) correct ms.¹ has לְמִנְחָה (without *vav*).

There are simply two considerations which keep us from changing the reading:—(1.) A *vav* would be more

¹ There are 167 references in this ms. to מִנְחָה or מִנְחָה. See Dr. Schiller-Szinessy in the Catalogue of Hebrew mss. preserved in the University Library, Cambridge, 1876, p. 17.

likely to be inserted in the text than to fall out of it.
 (2.) We regard the authority of the Massora, which we do not feel at liberty to set aside under present information.

JEREMIAH xxxiii. 18.

“Neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt-offerings, and to kindle meat-offerings, and to do sacrifice continually.” The LXX. entirely omits vers. 14–26. Jerome translates, *Et de sacerdotibus et de Levitis.* The Targum has no connective. None of the Hebrew mss. insert *vav* before **הֲלֵיכָם**.

EZEKIEL xliii. 19.

“And thou shalt give to the priests the Levites that be of the seed of Zadok, which approach unto me to minister unto me, saith the Lord God, a young bullock for a sin-offering.” The LXX. and the Targum agree with the Hebrew text. Jerome inserts a connective. The reading **וְהַלְיכָם** is found in the following mss. :—

Kenn. 109^v, *Harl.* 5709, *British Museum*, 12–13 cent. A.D. *Pent.*, *Hapht.*, and *Meg.* This codex, according to a private letter from Dr. Ginsburg, is very late and carelessly written.

Kenn. 170, *Florence* 10, 1296 A.D., private library. *Pent.*, *Hapht.*, and *Hagiogr.*, with Massora. This German manuscript was not found by Dr. Fausto Lasinio.

Kenn. 181. See under *Deut.* xxiv. 8, p. 200.

It is impossible for us to determine whether the *vav* in these passages was found by the scribe in the ms.

which he was copying, or was accidentally inserted by him. The reading with the connective is evidently not original.

EZEKIEL xliv. 15.

“ But the priests the Levites, the sons of Zadok, that kept the charge of my sanctuary when the children of Israel went astray from me, they shall come near to me to minister unto me,” etc. The LXX. and the Targum have no connective. Jerome inserts *et*. Kennicott does not give any Hebrew MSS. in which **וְהַלְוִים** occurs. We, however, found it in the two following MSS. :—

Kenn. 206, B. N. 5–6*, Paris. See under Deut. xxvii. 9, p. 201.

Kenn. 212, B. N. 39*, Paris. See under Isa. lxvi. 21. Yet in both these MSS. the *vav* has the sign of erasure from a later hand. Of course these readings, although occurring in two good MSS., have no weight.

EZRA x. 5.

“ Then arose Ezra, and made the chief priests, the Levites, and all Israel to swear that they should do according to his word.” The LXX. and Jerome insert the connective. The reading **וְהַלְוִים** occurs in the following MSS. :—

Kenn. 2*, *Neub.* 1, Bodleian, 1104 A.D. This Bible MS. is written in what Kennicott terms intermediate characters, *i.e.* between the square, erect, and elegant Spanish, and the thick and inclining German characters.

Manuscripts of this class are called Italian or French. This codex has, even now, many various readings. It had many more before it had been partially conformed to the present text. Kennicott doubts the date, because the ms. contains Rashi's († 1105 A.D.) commentary, whose death he falsely gives at about 1200.

Kenn. 48*, *Neub.* 101, Bodleian, 13–14 cent. A.D. Ezra (Nehem.), with interlinear Latin translation, Job, Lamentations, Esther, Ruth. This ms. is written in German characters without Massora.

Kenn. 210*, B. N. 32, Paris, 11–12 cent. A.D. This Bible codex, which should without doubt be considered one of the best, is written in intermediate characters. The Megilloth immediately precede Chronicles.

Kenn. 80, *Neub.* 2433, Bodleian, 12–13 cent. A.D. *Pent.*, *Hapht.*, *Psalm*s, *Job*, *Eccles.*, *Cant.*, *Lament.*, *Dan.*, *Esth.*, *Ezra*, *Nehem.*, *Chron.* This German ms. has many variations.

Kenn. 93, Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, A.D. 12–13 cent. *Proph.* and *Hagiogr.* This codex has many variations.

Kenn. 147¹ A.D. 12–13 cent. Public library, Strasburg, 3. Hagiographa. Bruns speaks of this codex in high terms.

Kenn. 228, Vatican Library, 1295 A.D., Urbin. 1. The Bible, with the Targum and the Massora. This

¹ It is well known that this and the other valuable mss. of the Strasburg Public Library were consumed by the flames during the bombardment of the city, Aug. 24–27, 1870.

German codex is very similar to Reuchlin's second codex in importance and manner of writing.

Kenn. 245,¹ A.D. 1290.² The later Prophets, except Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and the Hagiographa. It is written in German characters.

Cambridge, 13*, 12–13 cent. A.D.—(S. S.). Fine Spanish ms. with Massora. The margins are rich in rules and literature for the scribes. “Few biblical MSS. extant are of such value.”

Kenn. 206*, B. N. 5–6, Paris, 1298 A.D. See under Deut. xxvii. 9a, p. 201. This reading וְהַלְיוּם, with the sign of erasure on the *vav*, is not indicated by Bruns.

Kenn. 355*, B. N. 8–10, Paris, 1304 A.D. German Bible ms. with Massora. The Targum of Onkelos follows each verse of the Pentateuch. The reading with *vav*, which is marked with a sign of erasure, is not given by Bruns.

Kenn. 208*, B. N. 16, Paris, 12–13 cent. A.D. Psalms, Meg., Job, Prov., Dan., Ezra. Spanish ms. without Massora, which once belonged to Bomberg. Bruns makes no mention of the reading in Ezra.

Kenn. 319*, B. N. 28, Paris, 1344 A.D. Bible ms. with Massora. No mention is made of our reading by Bruns.

Kenn. 259, A.D. 1487. The Hagiographa printed at Naples without Massora.

Kenn. 101, B. M. Harl. 5498, Bible ms.; and B. N. 17–18*, Paris. Bible ms. with Targums.

¹ See Notes to Appendix iv. p. 231.

² This date is assigned by Wolf, on the authority of Reimarus, ii. p. 296, and iv. 82.

Kenn. 118, B. M. Harl. 5715, Hagiogr. (the *vav* has been erased). He assigns both mss. to the 14th cent.

Although we have the testimony of the LXX., Jerome, and several excellent mss., in favour of the reading with the connective, yet we are not inclined to think it original, according to the principle which we have already indicated, that *vav* is more likely to have been inserted afterwards, than to have fallen out from a ms.

NEHEMIAH x. 29 (E. v. 28).

“And the rest of the people, the priests, the Levites, the porters, the singers, the Nethinim,” etc.

The LXX. and Jerome do not insert a connective.

There is really no support for the reading **והלויים** which is found in *Kenn.* 128, 141 (with sign of erasure), 157 (*vav* inserted by a later hand), 166, 253, which belong to the 13–14 century. The connective occurs in *Kenn.* 342*, B. N. 27, Paris, a ms. dated 1295, but it has been added by a later hand.

NEHEMIAH x. 35 (E. v. 34).

“And we cast lots among the priests, the Levites, and the people, for the wood-offering,” etc.

The LXX. and Jerome insert the connective between priests and Levites. The following mss. have **והלויים** :—

Kenn. 2*, *Neub.* 1, Bodleian, 1104 A.D. See under Ezra x. 5, p. 214.

Kenn. 30*, *Neub.* 72, Bodleian, 11–12 cent. A.D.

Prophets and Hagiographa. This excellent codex is written in intermediate characters, and has many readings.

Kenn. 188^v, Milan 4, Ambrosian Library. German ms. *Hagiographa*. The *vav* has a sign of erasure.

Kenn. 17*, *Neub.* 4, Bodleian, 12–13 cent. A.D. See under Isa. lxvi. 21, p. 208.

Kenn. 80, *Neub.* 2433. See under Ezra x. 5, p. 215.

Kenn. 147. See under the same, p. 215.

Kenn. 172^v, Copenhagen 5, A.D. 13–14 cent. Bible ms. with Massora. The date 746 A.D., which occurs in several places, cannot be relied upon, since there have been erasures, and it has been added by a later hand.

Kenn. 128. Bible ms., 14 cent. A.D.

Kenn. 157, Public Library, Cassel, 13 cent. Pent., Hagiogr. The *vav* has been added by a later hand.

Kenn. 319*, B. N. 28, Paris, 1344 A.D. Bible with the Massora. Bruns has overlooked the reading.

Kenn. 321*, B. N., Paris, 1404 A.D. Bible with the Massora. Bruns has overlooked the reading.

Berlin, 5–7^v. See B., p. 204.

Kenn. 175^v, Copenhagen 3–4, A.D. 1462. This Spanish codex contains the Bible with Massora, the various readings of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali, and the Megillath Antiochus.

Kenn. 47*, *Neub.* 102, Bodleian, 14–15 cent. A.D. Ruth, Dan., Ezra (Neh.).

Hamburg, 22^v (Steinschn.). Daniel, Ezra (Nehemiah), Chronicles, without Massora.

There can be but little question here about the original reading. While it is quite probable that mss. with the connective were in existence when the Septuagint translation was made, it seems more probable to us that the reading of the Massora was original.

NEHEMIAH xi. 20.

“And the residue of Israel of the priests the Levites were in all the cities of Judah, every one in his own inheritance.”

This entire verse is wanting in LXX. except in certain mss. Among these is the Friderico-Augustanus,¹ in which it occurs with the connective. Jerome has *et Levitae*.

The following mss. have וַיַּלְמֹד:—

Kenn. 89*, Cambridge 12 (S.S.), 856 A.D. This Spanish ms. contains the Bible with Massora. Although Kennicott and Bruns doubted the genuineness of the epigraph, and agreed in assigning it to the thirteenth century, Dr. Schiller thinks that there is sufficient evidence for the date given above.

Kenn. 94, Library of the Emmanuel College, Cambridge, 1285 A.D. The *vav* has been erased.

Kenn. 245, Rotterdam 2, 1290 A.D.² The later Prophets and the Hagiographa with Massora. See p. 231.

¹ This fragment, as is well known, is a portion of the *Codex Sinaiticus*. See Dr. Caspar René Gregory in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Andover, January 1876, p. 167.

² Wolf, ii. 296, iv. 82, is authority for this date.

Kenn. 342*, B. N. 27, Paris, 1295 A.D. See under Neh. x. 27. The *vav*, which is very faint, has been added by a later hand.

Kenn. 30*, *Neub.* 72, Bodleian, 12–13 cent. A.D. See under Neh. x. 35.

Kenn. 147, Strasburg 3. See under Neh. x. 35, p. 218.

Kenn. 176^v, Copenhagen 6. The Bible without Massora. The *vav* has been effaced.

Cambridge, 20*. The Prophets and Hagiographa, with the Massora, in Franco-German characters.

Kenn. 309*, B. N. 16, Paris. See under Isa. lxvi. 21, p. 209. The reading with *vav*, which has the sign of erasure, has not been given by Bruns.

B. N. 22*, Paris. Spanish Bible with Massora. The *vav* has the sign of erasure.

Kenn. 141^v, Trinity College Library, Dublin, 14 cent. Prophets and Hagiographa. The *vav* has been erased.

Kenn. 48*, *Neub.* 101. See under Ezra x. 5, p. 214.

The same principles which we have already enunciated lead us to reject this reading as of later origin.

1 CHRONICLES ix. 2.

“Now the first inhabitants that dwelt in their possessions in their cities were the Israelites, the priests, Levites, and the Nethinim.”

While the LXX. omits the connective, Jerome and the Targum insert it, in agreement with the

accentuation of the Massoretic text. The following mss. have וְהַלְיוּם :—

Kenn. 89*, Cambridge 12, A.D. 856 (Kenn. 12-13 cent.). See under Neh. xi. 20, p. 219.

B. N. 8-10*, Paris, 1304. See under Isa. lxvi. 21, p. 207.

Kenn. 99*, King's 1, British Museum, 1385 A.D. This Bible ms. is written in Spanish characters, and contains a little of the Massora.

Kenn. 147, Strasburg 3, A.D. 12-13 cent. See Neh. x. 35, p. 218.

B. N. 17, Paris. See under Ezra x. 5. *Hamburg* 22 (Steinschn.). See Neh. x. 35, p. 218.

There cannot be the slightest doubt, notwithstanding the insertion of the connective in Jerome, the Targum, and the above mss., that originally there was no connective between priests Levites.

2 CHRONICLES v. 5.

“ And they brought up the ark, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and all the holy vessels that were in the tabernacle; these did the priests the Levites bring up.”

The LXX., Jerome, and the Targum insert respectively *kai', cum*, and *וְ*. The following mss. have וְהַלְיוּם :—

Kenn. 89*, Cambridge 12, A.D. 856 (Kenn. 12-13 cent.). See under Neh. xi. 20, p. 219.

Kenn. 2*, *Neub.* 1, 1104 A.D. See under Ezra x. 5, p. 214.

11-12 Cent. A.D.

Kenn. 180^v (Steinschn. 16, who considers Bruns' date doubtful). Prophets and Hagiographa, with Massora. Wolf, speaking of the age of this ms., says: "Venerandae vetustatis aetatem, quippe septem ferme seculorum, prae se ferens."¹

Kenn. 188^v, Milan 4, Ambrosian Library. See under Neh. x. 35, p. 218.

Kenn. 224^v, Königsberg 1102b. Prophets, Hagiographa. The *keri* is found in the text, without correction, in 192 places, but with correction in 416.

Kenn. 207*, B. N. 35, Paris, 1284 A.D. Some fragments of the Book of Num., then Ps., Prov., Job, Dan., Ezra (Neh.), and Chron. This ms. is written in Spanish characters without Massora.

Kenn. 170, Florence 10, A.D. 1296. Pent., Hapht., and Hagiographa, with Massora. German characters.

Kenn. 206*, B. N. 5-6, Paris, 1298 A.D. See under Deut. xxvii. 9. This passage is not given by Kennicott.

12-13 Cent. A.D.

Kenn. 147, Strasburg 3. See under Ezra x. 5.

Kenn. 80* (Neub. 2433). See under Ezra x. 5.

Kenn. 210*, B. N. 32, Paris. See under Ezra x. 5. The reading is not mentioned by Kennicott.

Kenn. 249, Turin 109. See under Isa. lxvi. 21.

B. N. 22*, Paris. Bible with Massora.

¹ *Bibliotheca Hebr.* vol. iv. p. 119.

De Rossi, 1^v. German Bible ms. with the Haphtaroth. In the Prophets the great Massora is found, but not in the Pentateuch or the Hagiographa.

De Rossi, 2^v. German Bible ms. with Massora. The great abundance of various readings plainly shows that the text is unmassoretic. Many of these are valuable.

De Rossi, 34^v. The Hagiographa with Massora and Rashi's Commentary. The ms. is written in German characters. It abounds in many and excellent variations. The *vav* has the sign of erasure.

De Rossi, 552^v. Spanish ms., without Massora. Prov., Job, and Chron. The *keri* is very rare.

De Rossi, 737^v. German ms. Proph. and Hagiogr., with the Targum and Massora.

Kenn. 82* (Neub. 2324), Bodleian, 1306 A.D. This Bible ms. is written in Spanish or intermediate characters. There are abundant erasures.

13-14 Cent. A.D.

Kenn. 118, Harl. 5715. Hagiographa.

Kenn. 166, Florence 6. Pentateuch and Hagiographa. Written in Spanish characters.

De Rossi, 824^v. The later Prophets and the Hagiographa, with both Massoras. The *vav* has the sign of erasure.

14-15 Cent. A.D.

Kenn. 71*. ms. from left to right, with interlinear Latin translation.

Kenn. 141^v. Library of the University of Dublin. Later Prophets and Hagiographa. N. B. The *vav* has been erased.

Cambridge, 15^u. See under *Josh.* iii. 3, p. 203.

De Rossi, 579^v. Bible ms. with both Massoras. It is written in Italian characters.

De Rossi, 4^v. Bible ms. in Spanish characters. The year 1496 is given as the date of purchase.

De Rossi, 517^v. The Hagiographa. Rabbinical characters.

De Rossi, 55^v and 789^v. The *vav* has been inserted in these mss. by a later hand.

Curtiss, 2. Spanish Bible ms. defective.

The agreement of some of the best mss. with the oldest versions is scarcely less remarkable here than in *Isa.* lxvi. 21. But here, as there, to say nothing of a far greater number of equally ancient mss., we hold it unlikely that a *vav* would fall out, and we abide by the decision of the Massora. Besides, we know that Rashi (1105) regarded the text without *vav* as correct. He says on ver. 5: "For the priests, although not really Levites, were also from the children of Levi, as it is also written in the Book of Kings;¹ And the priests carried the ark." We see from this that Rashi's interpretation is just the same here as those given by him in Deuteronomy, Joshua, and the Prophets. That none of the old versions and so few mss. insert the connective in Deuteronomy, while so many insert it here, is doubtless due, as we have already remarked,²

¹ 1 Kings viii. 4.

² See p. 194.

to the peculiarly sacred character of the Pentateuch; for the variations which we find in Joshua and elsewhere have, in the first instance, probably arisen either from the hand of some interpreter, or from a carelessness which would not have been allowed in the Pentateuch.

2 CHRONICLES xxiii. 18.

“ Also Jehoiada appointed the offices of the house of the Lord by the hand of the priests the Levites, whom David had distributed in the house of the Lord, to offer the burnt-offerings of the Lord,” etc.

The LXX. and Jerome have a connective, but the Targum agrees with the Hebrew. The reading וְהַלִּיּוֹת is only supported by the following MSS. :—

Kenn. 2[✉], *Neub.* 1, Bodleian. 1104 A.D. See under Ezra x. 5, p. 214.

Kenn. 206[✉], B. N. 5–6, Paris, 1298 A.D. See under Deut. xxvii. 9, p. 201.

Kenn. 175^v, Copenhagen 3–4, A.D. 1462. See under Neh. x. 35, p. 218.

Of course we should not think of changing the reading on this basis.

2 CHRONICLES xxx. 27a.

“ Then the priests the Levites arose and blessed the people.”

The following Greek mss. add *καὶ*, contrary to the received text: 60, 74, 106, 120, 121, 134, 158, 236. Ald. Alex. Jerome translates *atque Levitae*, and the Targum has *vav*. The following Hebrew have וְהַלִּיּוֹת :—

Kenn. 188^v, Milan 4, Ambrosian Library, 11–12 cent. A.D. The *rav* has the sign of erasure.

Kenn. 224^v, Königsberg 1102b. See under 2 Chron. v. 5. This reading with *rav* is not given in Kennicott.

12–13 Cent. A.D.

Kenn. 17^{*}, *Neub.* 4, Bodleian. See under Isa. lxvi. 21, p. 208.

Kenn. 194^v, Milan B. 11, Ambrosian Library. Spanish characters without Massora.

Kenn. 210^{*}, B. N. 32, Paris. See under Ezra x. 5, p. 215. Kennicott does not mention the reading in this MS.

Cambridge, 20^{*}. See under Neh. xi. 20, p. 220.

Kenn. 145, Strasburg 1, A.D. 1281. Prophets and Hagiographa. This codex, which is written in German characters, has many variations, which are worthy of mention, although it abounds in mistakes.

Kenn. 206^{*}, B. N. 5–6, Paris, 1298 A.D. See under Deut. xxvii. 9, p. 201. No notice of this reading in Kennicott. It has a sign of erasure.

Berlin, 585^v (Steinschn.). 1347 A.D. Italian Bible MS. The *rav* is not in the line.

Berlin, 5–7^v (Kenn. 607), Steinschn. See under Josh. iii. 3, p. 204.

B. N. 17^{*}, Paris. 13–14. See under Ezra x. 5, p. 216. The *rav* has a sign of erasure.

Kenn. 175^v, Copenhagen 3–4, A.D. 1462. See under Neh. x. 35, p. 218.

Hamburg, 19^v (Steinschn.), A.D. 1487. This Spanish

MS. contains the Prophets and the Hagiographa, with the Massora and the Megillath Antiochus.

14-15 Cent. A.D.

Cambridge, 16^x (S.S.). The Pentateuch and the Hagiographa, with Massora. "The text is a model of beauty and correctness, and in strict accordance with the **מסורת**, neglecting now and then the traditions of the Babylonian Talmud."

Hamburg, 22^y (Steinschn.). See under Neh. x. 35. The punctuator has left the *vav* unpointed.

De Rossi, 801. Hagiographa. This codex is very valuable, and abounds in various readings.

De Rossi, 187. Bible with Massora in Spanish characters.

Kenn. 270, A.D. 1517. Complutensian Bible.

The reading, as given in the present Hebrew text, seems to us to have been the original one. It must be remembered that, notwithstanding the mss. which we have quoted, the great mass of mss. given by Kennicott sustain the reading of the traditional text.

NOTES TO APPENDIX IV.

1.

While there are mss. in which twenty-three (1 Kings viii. 4; Ezra i. 5, iii. 8, 12, vi. 20, vii. 7, viii. 30, ix. 1; Neh. vii. 73, xi. 3, xii. 1; 1 Chron. xxiii. 2; 2 Chron.

viii. 15, xi. 13, xix. 8, xxiii. 4, xxiv. 5, xxx. 15, 25, xxxi. 2, xxxv. 8, 18) of the thirty-four passages where the expression priests and Levites occurs are without a connective, the following five may possibly have been without *vav* in some of the MSS. in the time of Rabbi Joshua ben-Levi (250 A.D.) :—

1 KINGS viii. 4b.

“ Even those did the priests and Levites bring up.” The LXX. omit these words altogether. Jerome (420) and the Targum (fourth century) have the connective. Kennicott quotes the following MSS. as supporting the reading without *vav*: 30 (Neub. 72), 70, 82 (Soria, A.D. 1306), 85, 95, 187^v (� add. by punct.), which, according to him, belong to the 13 cent. except No. 95, which he assigns to the fifteenth. *Curtiss* 2 has הלוּם.

EZRA iii. 12.

“ But many of the priests and Levites, and chief of the fathers,” etc. The LXX. and Jerome have the connective. Kennicott quotes the following MSS. as omitting the connective: 47 (Neub. 102), 89, 141^v (� has been added), 147, 224^v (Königsberg Royal and University Library, 1102b), 240.

NEHEMIAH xi. 3b.

“ Israel, the priests, and the Levites.” The LXX. has the connective. Jerome omits it perhaps for the sake of good Latinity. Kenn. הלוּם, 2 (Neub. 1), 48

(Neub. 101), 141^v (ι has been added), 150, 166 (Florence, Laurentian Library, Plut. 3, A.D. 1418). A comparison of this passage with x. 27 shows how easily the connective might have been wanting in the original ms.

NEHEMIAH xii. 1.

“Now these are the priests and the Levites.” The LXX. and Jerome have the connective. It is wanting in the following mss.: Kenn. 4 (Neub. 16), 17 (Neub. 4), 30 (Neub. 72), 198, 224^v (Königsberg).

2 CHRONICLES xxiv. 5a.

“And he gathered together the priests and the Levites.” The LXX., Jerome, and the Targum have the connective. The following mss. and Bibles have הַלִּיּם: Kenn. 89 (Schiller-Szinessy, 1. He holds that the epigraph is genuine, and that the ms. dates from 856 A.D. See the catalogue of the Hebrew mss. of the University Library, Cambridge, 1876, pp. 12–15), 99 (Brit. Mus., King’s 1), 118, 144, 168 (ι has been erased), 175, 198 (ι has been erased), 210 (B. N., Paris 32), 240, 253, 300, 601; the Soncino (1488), Brescia (1494), Bomberg (1517, 21), Munster (1534), Basel (1536), but not in Michaelis, 1720, as Kennicott asserts, all omit *vav*. It seems to us that this reading, which is supported by so many excellent mss., conforms better to the sense of the passage than the one with the connective. At the end of the fourth verse it is said that the Levites did not hasten to make

the levy, but there is nothing in the context which shows that their conduct is contrasted with that of the priests, which would be implied if we inserted a connective between priests and Levites.

It is indeed uncertain whether the remark of Joshua ben-Levi, which is repeated every time with reference to Ezek. xliv. 15, is correct. It is now impossible to prove whether there were twenty-four such places when the statement was made. The remark in Bereshith Rabba, which Rashi quotes in his Commentary on Josh. iii. 3, that there are forty-five such places, is evidently false. See p. 232.

2.

Monsieur Zotenberg, of the National Library, Paris, has made the following communication to me in regard to these manuscripts:—

“Les mss. Nos. 1314–1315 ne sont pas datés. Je crois qu'ils sont du xiii^e siècle. Une note fabriquée par un juif moderne leur assigne la date fabuleuse du viii^e siècle.”

3.

We received the following response in regard to two mss. which in Kennicott's time were in Venice:—

Litteras tuas 1 mensis Septembris datas accepi, quibus a me petisti mss. duorum notitiam, nempe Cod. 564 *Venet. bibl. Cornelian.* et Cod. 571 *Venet. penes Abr. Cracovia*, quos memorat Kennicott in sua dissertatione generali, etc. pag. 509–510. Sed ab anno quo auctor ille scribebat, ad præsens usque tempus,

bibliothecæ Venetarum familiarum fere omnes, post extremas Reipublicæ jacturas, dispersæ atque venundatæ sunt, ita ut earum hodie ne vestigium quidem extet. Propterea mihi displicet desiderium tuum explere non posse. Secundiorem igitur occasionem velim mihi præbeas. Vale.

VENETIIS, iii. *id. Septembris.*

JOANNES VELUDO,
Biblioth. D. Marci Venet. Praefectus.

4.

Prof. Dr. H. Oort, of Leyden, has given us the following interesting particulars in regard to *Kenn.* 244–245 (see p. 216):—“Rotterdam, 1, 2 penes Clariss. Meermann:” “Gerard Meerman died 1771. His famous library passed to his son John, after whose decease it was sold in 1824 at auction by the Luchtmans. The MSS. are mentioned under No. 1 (Orient. cod.), vol. 4 of the printed catalogue. They were purchased by a Mr. Payne of London, who belonged to a firm, afterwards known as Payne and Fog, which was dissolved in 1844.” It is to be hoped that these valuable MSS. may be identified.

POSTSCRIPT.—We take this opportunity for thanking Dr. Christian D. Ginsburg, who is now issuing a work on the Massora, the fruit of twenty years of study, for valuable massoretic and other information. As it was the same in kind with that which had been previously furnished by Dr. Baer, p. 190, we could not use it. We also, in the same connection, thank Mr. Hessel, of Trinity College Library, Dublin, for verifying several passages in *Kenn.* 141.

Dr. A. Berliner, who is an authority for the text of Rashi, writes:—

“ Die Stelle in Raschi zu Joshua iii. 3 ist ein Zuzatz, der sich in vielen Handschriften nicht findet. מ"ר in der Stelle heisst מפי רבינו. Die ganze Stelle ist corrumpirt und lautete sicher בב"ד מוקמוות wie in den vier und zwanzig Stellen des Talmud, und hat demnach mit ב"ר (בראשית רבה) gar nichts zu thun.”

Valuable additions, by Cav. Pietro Perrau, to *Mss. Codices Hebraici Biblioth. I. B. De Rossi*, etc., Parmae 1803, may be found in the *Hebräische Bibliographie*, edited by Dr. M. Steinschneider, Berlin 1864–1872.

INDEXES.

INDEX L.

MANUSCRIPTS AND ANCIENT PRINTED TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Ambrosian Library, Milan—		Bodleian Library, Cambridge—	
<i>Kenn.</i> 187, B. 56, . . . 203, 228		<i>Kenn.</i> 1, Neub. 8-9, . . . 202, 207	
„ 188, E. 84, . . . 218, 222		„ 2, Neub. 1, . . . 214, 217,	
„ 193, G. 2, 201		„ 221, 225, 228	
„ 194, B. 11, 226		„ 4, Neub. 16,	
„ 421, C. 149, 207		„ 198, 201, 229	
 Basel University Library—		„ 9, Neub. 201	
<i>Kenn.</i> 390, 207		„ 17, Neub. 4,	
 Berlin Royal Library—		„ 208, 218, 226, 229	
<i>Kenn.</i> 150, Steinschneider		„ 30, Neub. 72,	
1-4, 209, 229		„ 217, 220, 228, 229	
„ 264, Brescia Bible,		„ 47, Neub. 102, . . . 218, 228	
204, 229		„ 48, Neub. 101,	
„ 607, Steinschn. 5-7,		„ 215, 220, 228	
204, 210, 226		„ 80, Neub. 2433,	
„ 608, Steinschn. 8, . . . 210		„ 215, 218, 222	
„ 611, Steinschn. 9, . . . 207		„ 82, Neub. 2324,	
<i>Berlin.</i> 585, 226		„ 223, 228	
 Berne Public Library—		„ 84, Neub. 2325, . . . 200	
<i>Kenn.</i> 149, 209		„ 85, Neub. 2331, . . . 228	
<i>Neub.</i> 7, 211		 Bodleian Library, Cambridge—	
„ 20, 208		„ 21, 198, 199	
„ 21, 206		„ 23, 206	

PAGE	PAGE
Bologna, Dominican Library— <i>Kenn.</i> 526, 209	<i>Kenn.</i> 175, 3-4, 218, 225, 226, 229 ,, 176, 6, 220
British Museum— <i>Kenn.</i> 99, King's 1, 221, 229 ,, 101, Harl. 5498, . 216 ,, 108, Harl. 7621, . 210 ,, 109, Harl. 5709, . 213 ,, 118, Harl. 5715, 217, 223, 229 Add. 26,878, . . 198	Corpus Christi, Oxford— <i>Kenn.</i> 69, W. B. 4, 7, 24, 198, 199, 200 <i>Kenn.</i> 70, E. 3, 8, 228 ,, 71, W. D. 1, 5, . . 223
Cambridge University Library— <i>Kenn.</i> 89, 12 S.S., 219, 221, 228 S.S. 13, 216 ,, 15, . . 203, 205, 224 ,, 16, 227 ,, 17, 199 ,, 18, 210 ,, 20, 220, 226	Curtiss— Hebr. MS. No. 2, . . 224, 228
Cambridge, Library of the Emmanuel College— <i>Kenn.</i> 94, 219	Dublin, Trinity College Library— <i>Kenn.</i> 141, . . 220, 224, 228
Cambridge, Library of St. John the Evangelist— <i>Kenn.</i> 95, 210, 228 ,, 96, 210	Florence— <i>Kenn.</i> 166, Florence 6, . . 229 ,, 170, Florence 10, . . 213
Carlsruhe— <i>Kenn.</i> 154, Carlsruhe 1, . 206 De 50, The Soncino Bible, . . 204, 229	Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge— <i>Kenn.</i> 93, 209
Cassel Public Library— <i>Kenn.</i> 157, 218	Hamburg City Library— <i>Steinschn.</i> 3, <i>Kenn.</i> 616, . . 202 ,, 15, 201 ,, 19, 226 ,, 22, . . 218, 221, 227 <i>Kenn.</i> 180, <i>Steinschn.</i> 16, 205, 222
Cesena— <i>Kenn.</i> 536, 207	Helmstedt— <i>Kenn.</i> 181, 200, 213
Copenhagen Royal Library— <i>Kenn.</i> 172, Copenhagen 5, 218 ,, 174, 203, 205	Königsberg University Library— <i>Kenn.</i> 224, Königsberg 1102b, 222, 226, 228
Manheim— <i>Kenn.</i> 379, 210	Mayence— <i>Kenn.</i> 375, 205

	PAGE			PAGE
Modena—				
<i>Kenn.</i> 541,	210	<i>De Rossi</i>	4,	204, 224
,, 544, F. 8,	209	,,	20,	207
		,,	34,	223
		,,	55,	224
Munich Royal Library—				
<i>Kenn.</i> 383, Munich 2,	209	„	187,	203, 227
		„	197,	210
		„	226,	202
Nuremberg—				
<i>Kenn.</i> 198,	203, 229	„	248,	208
,, 201,	207	„	262,	208
		„	305,	203, 210
		„	384,	210
Padua, Benedictine Library—				
<i>Kenn.</i> 560,	210	„	419,	209
		„	440,	209
		„	507,	209
		„	512,	209
Paris National Library—				
<i>B. N.</i> , Paris 16,	209, 216	„	517,	224
,, Paris 17,	216, 221, 226	„	552,	223
,, Paris 22,	220, 223	„	555,	209
<i>Kenn.</i> 206, B. N. 5-6,		„	579,	224
201, 206, 216,		„	594,	208
222, 225, 226		„	606,	209
,, 207, B. N. 35,	222	„	700,	209
,, 208, B. N. 16,	216	„	715,	209
,, 210, B. N. 32,	215, 222,	„	737,	223
	226, 229	„	789,	224
,, 212, B. N. 39,	209, 214	„	801,	227
,, 220, B. N. 80,	208	„	824,	223
,, 309, B. N. 16,	220	„	825,	209
,, 319, B. N. 28,	216, 218	„	883,	210
,, 321, B. N.,	218	„	892,	208
,, 335, B. N. 41,	209			
,, 342, B. N. 27,	206, 217,			
	219			
,, 355, B. N. 8-10,				
207, 216, 219, 221				
,, 366, B. N. 86,	208			
,, 367, B. N. 38,	207			
<i>B. N.</i> , 1314-15,	203, 230			
Parma Royal Library—				
<i>De Rossi</i> 1,	203, 210, 223			
,, 2,	210, 223			
Rome, Angelican Library—				
<i>Kenn.</i> 240,	229			
,, 467, Bib. Angelic.				
		11,		210
		468, Bib. Angelic.		
		12,		210
Rome, Casanatian Library—				
<i>Kenn.</i> 446, Bib. Casant.				
		13,		209
Rome, Vatican Library—				
<i>Kenn.</i> 225, Urbin. 2,	202, 208			

	PAGE		PAGE
<i>Kenn.</i> 228, <i>Urbin.</i> 1, .	215	Turin—	
„ 486, <i>Pal.</i> 14, .	207	<i>Kenn.</i> 246, <i>Turin</i> 1, .	207
„ 487, <i>Pal.</i> 15, .	210	„ 248, . . .	208
St. Genovive—		„ 249, <i>Turin</i> 4, 209, 222	
<i>Kenn.</i> 368,	207	„ 251, <i>Turin</i> 6, .	207
St. Petersburg, Imperial Public Library—		Vienna, Imperial Library—	
No. B. 3,	206	<i>Kenn.</i> 588, No. 10, .	207
		„ 590, No. 3, .	207
		„ 593, No. 12, .	207

INDEX II.

NAMES AND SUBJECTS.

Aaron the Levite, Ex. iv. 14, p. 25; the representative of his tribe, p. 27; scarcely mentioned in Deut. (Graf), p. 58, r. 2; bearer of Urim and Thummim, p. 59; not allowed to mourn for Nadab and Abihu, p. 60; only Aaron and his sons may burn incense, p. 63; two branches of his house, Eleazar and Ithamar, p. 75; mentioned in Ezra vii. 5, p. 112. Aben Ezra († 1167), interpretation of Deut. x. 8, pp. 18, 21; Deut. xviii. 1a, p. 23; Deut. xviii. 8b, p. 49.

Abiathar deposed, p. 88.

Ahia. *See* Ahimelech.

Ahimelech, bearer of the ephod, p. 86; origin due to a copyist's mistake (Graf), p. 107; the same as Abiathar, *ibid.* r. 3; son of Abiathar, p. 108, r.

Ainsworth, Henry († about 1650), interpretation of Deut. x. 8, pp. 10, 18, 21; Deut. xviii. 1, p. 34; Deut. xviii. 6a, p. 47.

Alcibiades, Second, quotation from, p. 134.

Amos' preaching directed against hypocrisy, p. 127; his use of Thorah, p. 179.

Anathoth, a priestly city, p. 136, r. 2.

Archiv fur Wissenschaftl. Erforschung d. A. T., pp. 69, 104.

Ark, its bearers, pp. 10-15; the Levites ordinarily carried it, but the priests also on rare occasions, p. 14.

Asyndeton in Deut. xviii. 1, p. 25.

Baba Kamma, first treatise of the fourth Seder of the Mishnah, its Gemara on Deut. xviii. 6a, p. 47.

Baudissin, Wolf, Count, Professor, Strasburg, his interpretation of Amos v. 26, p. 127, r. 1.

Benediction, priestly, pp. 18-21.

Bertheau, E., Professor, Göttingen, on the recurrence of the names

of high priests, p. 108; on 2 Chron. xxxii. 32, p. 171; communication of a letter from Graf, p. 172, r. 2.

Biesenthal, J. H. R., Leipzig, on Jer. vii. 22, 23, p. 134.

Bonfrerius, a Jesuit (†1643, Tourney), interpretation of Deut. x. 8, p. 21, r. 1.

Brambach, W., Director of the Royal and University Library at Königsberg, p. 192.

Bruun, Director of the Royal Library, Copenhagen, p. 192.

Buxtorf, John, jr., Professor, Basle (†1664), on the Urim and Thummim, p. 59.

Ceriani, Director of the Ambrosian Library, Milan, pp. 193, 196.

Chagigah, twelfth treatise of the second Seder of the Mishnah, for its Gemara on the Sophrim, see p. 162.

Chronicler, author of fictitious genealogies (Colenso), p. 104, r. 1; a bad arithmetician, p. 109; has changed the history for 2000 years (Colenso), 119; not guilty of forgery, p. 120; his sources, p. 168.

Chronicles, their author a Levite, p. 100; references to earlier works, pp. 101, 102; only useful as a picture of post-exilic times (Graf), p. 110; prerogatives of the high priest not given in Chronicles, p. 111; text not impaired by minor inaccuracies, p. 118.

Chullin, third treatise of the fifth Seder of the Mishnah, on Deut. xviii. 3, p. 44.

Cities, Levitical and Priestly, affirmed that Deuteronomy affords no trace of them, p. 47; may not conclude that they did not exist in the time of Joshua, 2 Kings, p. 90; Shechem, pp. 93, 95, r.; Beth-shemesh, p. 96; Anathoth, p. 97.

Colenso, John William, Bishop, Natal, on the use of the Hebrew participle, Deut. xxxi. 9, p. 11, r. 1; holds that the priests were bearers of the ark, p. 11; on the use of the preterite in Deut. x. 9, p. 28; on Deut. xviii. 6-8, p. 46; Dathan and Abiram, p. 63; says that the passage about Phinehas in Judges has been interpolated, p. 84, r. 5; tribe of Levi did not exist in the time of Deborah, p. 92; small number of priests in David's time, p. 93; Samuel cannot have been a Levite, p. 94; his attack on the Chronicler, p. 119; reason why Malachi does not mention the sons of Aaron, p. 141.

Covenant said to have been made with Levi, p. 27; *Book of Covenant*, pp. 3, 164, r. 1.

Critics, unreasonable demands, p. 85.

Dathan and Abiram do not exclude Korah, p. 64.

Davidson, A. B., Professor, Edinburgh, on the perfect tense, p. 28, r. 1.

Delitzsch, Franz, Professor, Leipzig, reason of variations in the names of the twelve tribes, p. 29, r. 1; Isa. i. 7 an echo of Lev. xxvi. (Deut. xxviii.), p. 73; on 2 Chron.

xxxii. 32, p. 171 ; on the sources of the Chronicler, pp. 172, 173 ; cites passages to prove that the prophecy of Isaiah is from one author, p. 183, r. 2.

Deuteronomist does not confer the priesthood upon the Levites, p. 146.

Deuteronomy, its date and author (Kuenen), p. 3 ; people's book, p. 66 ; presupposes a code of laws, p. 164 ; used by Jeremiah, p. 166, r. 1.

"Deuteronomy the People's Book," author of, on the argument from silence, p. 81 ; on diversity of style in the same writer, p. 183.

Dillmann, August, Professor, Berlin, p. 194.

Duhm, Bernh., Professor, Göttingen, holds that Ezra was the Elohist, p. 69, r. 5 ; prophets antagonistic to ceremonial observances, p. 121 ; no sacrificial laws of Mosaic origin, p. 132.

Duncker, Max. W., Privy Councillor, Berlin, does not refer the origin of the tribe of Levi to Levi at all, p. 28, r. 3 ; date of Moses, p. 163, r. 1.

Edersheim, Rev. Dr., Bournemouth, on the root meaning of the Hebrew word for priest, p. 58, r. 1.

Eichhorn, Joh. Gottfr., Professor, Göttingen († 1827), on the Chaldaisms in Ezekiel, p. 74.

Eleazar, successor of Aaron, p. 58.

Eli undoubtedly a high priest, p. 85.

Elohist was Ezra (Graf, Kuenen, Duhm, and others), p. 69.

Elohistic Codification of priestly laws (Kuenen), p. 68.

Encyclopædia Britannica. *See* Prof. Smith.

English kings, comparative table of, p. 109.

Ephod, different kinds distinguished, p. 86.

Ewald, Heinrich, Professor, Göttingen († 1875), on the perfect tense, p. 28, r. 1.

Ezekiel, book of, date, p. 68 ; author of Lev. xvii.-xxvi. (Graf, Kuenen, Kayser), p. 69 ; betrays a familiarity with the entire Pentateuch, pp. 69-72 ; author of Lev. xi.-xv. (Kayser), p. 72 ; influence of Leviticus on him, p. 73 ; style and Chaldaisms distinguish him from the author of Lev. xvii.-xxvi., p. 74 ; portrays an ideal state, p. 77.

Ezra weaves Lev. xvii.-xxvi. into the Pentateuch (Graf and others), p. 69 ; Arabic traditions as to him, pp. 153, 154 ; Christian traditions, pp. 154-156 ; fourth book of, pp. 155, 156 ; Jewish traditions, pp. 157-160 ; mentioned by Josephus, pp. 160, 161 ; the ready scribe, p. 162 ; author of programme, 164.

Firstlings discussed, pp. 39, 40.

Fleischer, H. L., Professor of Oriental Languages, Leipzig, interpretation of *Kâhin* (priest), p. 58, r. 1.

Gates. *See* Cities, p. 51.

Geiger, Abraham, Rabbi, Breslau († 1874), on Dathan and Abiram, p. 64.

Graf, Karl Heinrich, Professor,

Meissen († 1869), on the bearers of the ark, p. 10, r. 5; holds that any Levite might become a priest, pp. 23, 46, 55; origin of Levi, p. 28; Aaron only mentioned in Deuteronomy as saved from execution, p. 58; applies **אֵשׁ חָסִיד** to the whole tribe of Levi, p. 61; arguments for the Ezekielian authorship of Lev. xviii.-xxvi., p. 73; Eli merely a Levite, p. 85; Samuel not a Levite, p. 94, r. 5; Nob not mentioned in the list of priestly cities, p. 96; no trace of such cities, p. 97; the Chronicler always distinguishes between priests and Levites, p. 98; compares the standpoint of the Chronicler with that of a Roman Catholic church historian, p. 100, r. 1; on the genealogies of the Chronicler, pp. 104-108; claims that Deuteronomy gives no trace of the high priest as he appeared in the second temple, p. 111; asserts that priests and Levites are everywhere distinguished in Chronicles, p. 114, r. 5; Levites subordinate to Aaronitic priests in Chronicles, p. 116; Septuagint text of Jeremiah, p. 135.

Gramberg, K. P. W., Züllichau († 1830), on Samuel's fictitious genealogy, p. 104; the Chronicler a forger, p. 120.

Green, William Henry, Professor, Princeton, on the use of the preterite, p. 28, r. 1.

Grimm, C. L. W., Professor, Jena, definition of scribe (*γραμματις*), p. 162.

Guthe, Hermann, Privat Docent,

Leipzig, holds that Jer. xxxiii. 14-26 is an interpolation, p. 135, r. 3.

Haggai manifests no antipathy to the priests, p. 137.

Hamburger, J., Rabbi, Strelitz, on the number of the high priests, p. 109.

Heman and Ethan, their fictitious genealogy (Graf), p. 105.

Hengstenberg, Ernst. Wilh., Professor, Berlin († 1869), on the firstlings, p. 41, r. 3.

Herxheimer, Sal., Rabbi, Bernburg, his interpretation of Deut. xviii. 6-8, pp. 46, 47.

Hierarchy only attained full power with the extinction of prophecy, p. 121.

High Priest, this designation occurs only three times in the Pentateuch, p. 58; reason why his sacerdotal character is not indicated in Josh., p. 84; first among equals (Kuenen), p. 86; the line begins with Aaron, p. 89; succession from Aaron compared to succession of popes from Peter (Graf), p. 108, r. 3; number of high priests, p. 109; titles, p. 111; not described in Chronicles, p. 112.

Hilkiah perhaps the author of Deut. (Kuenen), pp. 3, 149; high priest, p. 88.

Hitzig, Ferdinand, Prof., Heidelberg († 1875), on the Chaldaisms of Ezekiel, p. 74.

Homberg, Herz, Prague († 1841), on Deut. xviii. 6-8, p. 45.

Hophni and Phinehas, their conduct diminished the influence of the priesthood, p. 82.

Hosea, evidence of his acquaintance with the law, pp. 128, 129, 176-178 ; use of the Thorah, 175-179.

Inheritance of Levi, where promised, pp. 33, 34.

Isaiah not a collection of prophecies, p. 129 ; priests and Levites, p. 130 ; the authorship of xl.-lxvi., pp. 182-189.

Ithamar, house of, rejected, p. 75 ; reason why it is without a genealogy, p. 108.

James of Edessa, his Syriac version, p. 192.

Jehoiada, high priest, p. 88.

Jeremiah not opposed to sacrifices, p. 132 ; the Septuagint text of his prophecy, p. 135, r. 3.

Jeroboam I. (975-954 B.C.) deprived the Levites of their possessions, p. 51 ; chose non-Levitical priests, p. 98.

Jeroboam II. (800 B.C.), the author of Deut. xxxiii. was his contemporary (Kuenen), p. 56.

Jerusalem, a new, desired by the prophets, p. 144.

Jewish and Christian Church compared, pp. 80, 99.

Joel not antagonistic to the priests, p. 124.

Joma, fifth treatise of the second Seder of the Mishnah, reference to its Jerusalem Gemara, p. 109, r. 2, 3.

Josephus (6. 37-38 A.D.) on the priests' perquisites, p. 40 ; mentions Zadok and Abiathar, p. 87 ; Levites excused from military duty, p. 92 ; number of high priests, p. 109, r. 2 ; merely says that Ezra was sufficiently acquainted with the laws of Moses, p. 160.

Joshua, successor of Moses, p. 63 ; book of, indicates priests and a high priest, p. 82 ; added as the sixth part to the Pentateuch, p. 83.

Judges, period of, unfavourable for the growth of the priesthood, p. 82.

Kayser, Aug., Professor, Strasburg, Levi set apart at Jotbata, p. 9 ; God made a covenant with Levi, p. 27 ; any Levite might become a priest, p. 46 ; Deuteronomist only mentions Dathan and Abiram, p. 63.

Keil, Carl Friedrich, Professor, resides in Leipzig, on Deut. x. 8, p. 15 ; holds that **לְבָנָיו** is never used of ordinary slaughtering, p. 42 ; on Deut. xviii. 6a, p. 47.

Kiddushin, seventh treatise of the third Seder of the Mishnah, for its Gemara on the Sophrim, p. 162, r. 1.

Kimchi, David, born at Narbonne (†about 1232), on 2 Chron. v. 4, p. 13 ; on 2 Sam. vii. 18, p. 108.

Kings, books of, make little mention of the priests, p. 80 ; mention the Levites only once, p. 97.

Klostermann, Heinr. Aug., Professor, Kiel, refutes the Ezekielian authorship of Lev. xviii.-xxvi., p. 69.

Kohen (priest), his business consists in giving oracles (Land), p. 57.

Kohn, Samuel, Rabbi, Budapest, p. 198.

Korah, tradition about him in the Midrash, p. 44; Deuteronomist does not mention him, p. 63.

Kuenen, A., Professor, Leyden, his standpoint, p. 1; his investigation is biassed, p. 5; holds that any Levite may become a priest, p. 55; his interpretation of Deut. xxxiii. 8, p. 57; date of Ezekiel, p. 68, r. 1; holds that the high priest was first among equals, p. 86; that there is a "clerical error" in 1 Kings viii. 4, p. 97; that every Israelite is competent to offer sacrifices, p. 103, r. 3; that there was no room for the prophet in Ezra's society, p. 122; on the final redaction of the Thorah, p. 138; the raising of the law to supreme power, *ibid.*; revolution under Ezra, p. 139; Thorah committed to writing, p. 140, r. 3; holds that the contemporaries of the Deuteronomist committed fictions without any qualms of conscience, p. 152, r. 1; Book of the Covenant, p. 164.

Land, J. P. N., Professor, Leyden, on the origin of the tribe of Levi, p. 28, r. 5; on the meaning of the Hebrew word for priest, p. 57, r. 1.

a-Lapide, Cornelius, a Jesuit, Belgium († 1637), interpretation of Deut. x. 8, p. 21; on 2 Sam. viii. 17, p. 108.

Lasinio, Fausto, Professor, Florence, p. 192.

Levi, the covenant with him, p. 27. **Levi, Rabbi Joshua Ben,** mentions

that there are twenty-four places where the priests are called Levites, p. 190.

Levites, cases where they are sent to minister to the Lord, pp. 16, 17; any Levite may become a priest (Graf), pp. 23, 46, 55, 69; distinguished from the priests, p. 23; Aaron termed a Levite, p. 25, r. 2; the tribe did not originate from Levi (Vatke and others), p. 28; the nature of the inheritance promised, pp. 29, 36; tribe said to have been maintained by sacrifices, p. 30; service in which they might voluntarily engage, p. 45; both priests and Levites included under Levites, p. 47; circumstances, p. 49; perquisites, p. 50; could sell their houses, p. 51; deprived of their possessions, p. 51; are all gifted with Urim and Thummim (Graf, Kuenen, and others), p. 55; degraded priests, pp. 74, 76; mentioned in Judges, p. 82; expression used of the entire tribe, p. 91; the priesthood their inheritance, p. 91; the two mentioned in Judges, p. 92; excused from military duty, p. 92; mentioned only twice in Samuel, p. 94; mentioned only once in Kings, p. 97.

Levitical Priests, developed into the Aaronitic, p. 69; in Chronicles, pp. 114-118; in Jeremiah, p. 136.

Leviticus, Ezekiel the author of xviii.-xxvi. (Graf and others), p. 69; of xi.-xv. (Kayser), p. 72; similarity between Lev. xxvi. and Jeremiah, p. 72.

Levy, J., Rabbi, Breslau, on the Sophrim, p. 162.

Lowth, William, Prebendary of Winchester († 1732), on Jer. vii. 22, 23, p. 134.

Lundius, Johannis, Schleswig († 1747), explains when the tribe of Levi was reckoned among other tribes, p. 29, r. 1.

Maimonides († 1205), interpretation of Deut. x. 8, p. 19; xviii. 1, p. 34; Ezek. xliv. 13, p. 76; Jer. vii. 22, 23, p. 133.

Malachi makes no allusion to the great epoch which Ezra is said to have ushered in, p. 139; character of his teaching, p. 143.

Manuscripts, their character, p. 195.

Massah. *See* p. 60.

Massora, nineteen places where priests are called Levites, p. 190; our ignorance as to the time and manner in which it originated, p. 193; we yield to its authority, p. 194.

Massorites, celebrated ones are to be found in all lands, p. 195.

Menachoth, the second treatise of the fifth Seder of the Mishnah; for its Gemara on Deut. xviii. 6a, *see* p. 47; on 2 Kings xxiii. 8, 9, p. 76.

Mercerus, Johannes, Professor of Hebrew, Paris († 1570), p. 21.

Meribah a real place. *See* pp. 59, 60.

Merx's Archiv. *See* Archiv.

Micah, his acquaintance with the Pentateuch, p. 131.

Middle Books of the Pentateuch (Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers), their origin, p. 3.

Ministers of the sanctuary are the priests, p. 16; ministers of the house are the Levites, p. 16.

Mishnah (end of 2d cent. A.D.), quotation from Bechoroth, p. 40.

Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy discussed, pp. 149-152.

Mosaic spirit stifled prophecy (critics), p. 123.

Munk, Salomon, Professor, Paris († 1867), p. 133.

Munster, Sebastian, Professor, Basel († 1552), p. 21.

Neubauer, Adolph, Librarian of the Bodleian Library, pp. 191, 198.

Obed-edom was made a Levite (Graf), p. 104.

Oehler, G. F., Professor, Tübingen († 1872), opinion as to Ahimelech, p. 108.

Offerings defined, p. 32.

Oort, H., Professor, Leyden, p. 193.

Patriarchs not historical personages (Kuenen), p. 2.

Perreau, Pietro Cav., Librarian, Parma, p. 193.

Pesikta rabbathi (2d half of 9th cent.), p. 44.

Pesikta zutarta, commentary to the Pentateuch and five rolls (12th cent. A.D.), distinguishes the tithes, p. 53.

Philo (born about 20 B.C.), passage which explains Deut. xviii. 3.

Phinehas, the covenant with him, p. 27; honourably mentioned in Joshua, pp. 83, 84; once in Judges, p. 84.

“Pious frauds” must not be imputed to the Chronicler alone (Kuenen), p. 120, r. 1.

Polus, or Pool, Matthew († 1679), author of the *Synopsis Critorum*, etc., p. 108.

Popes, comparative table, p. 109.

Priests, twenty-four places in which they are called Levites, p. 13; occasions on which they carried the ark, p. 15; before the exile all were gifted with Urim and Thummim (Kuenen), p. 57; giving of oracles their proper task, *ibid.*; may not conclude that they did not offer sacrifices, p. 89; the sons of Aaron in the Ezekielian portion of Leviticus, p. 114.

Priests Levites, expression occurs in nineteen places, p. 115, r. 1.

Priests and Levites found in thirty-four places, p. 115, r.

Priestly functions, guarding the law, p. 61; judging, p. 62; burning of incense, p. 63; putting sacrifices on the altar, p. 65.

Priestly code, the result of development (Kuenen and others), p. 163.

Priestly legislation, obtained historical support by a “pious fraud” (Kuenen), p. 3.

Programme (a written statement of an individual’s or a party’s wishes or intentions) of Ezra (Kuenen), pp. 3, 164; sons of Aaron not in the programme, p. 113.

Prophets, the only reliable sources of historical information (Kuenen), p. 2.

Prophets, Israelitish religion began with them, p. 122; presuppose the people’s acquaintance with a moral law, p. 123; make room for the scribes, p. 139, r. 2.

Rabbins, any of the twenty-four divisions of priests might offer at will, p. 47.

Radak. *See* (Rabbi David) Kimchi.

Rambam. *See* (Rabbi Moses Ben Maimun) Maimonides.

Rashbam (Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir, great-grandson of Rashi—1100–1160), comment on Deut. x. 8, p. 10.

Rashi, *i.e.* Rabbi Shelomo Jizhak († 1105), interpretation of Deut. x. 8, pp. 10, 18, 21; 2 Chron. v. 5, 7, p. 13; 1 Chron. xv. 26, p. 15; Deut. xviii. 1, p. 34; on the firstlings, p. 40; Deut. xviii. 6a, p. 47; Jer. vii. 22, 23, p. 135.

Reicke, Director of the Library at Königsberg, p. 192.

Riehm, Edward, Professor, Halle, holds that there is an asyndeton in Deut. xviii. 1, p. 25, r. 1; that the priests receive the whole of the firstlings, p. 41, r. 3.

Buetschi, Professor, Berne, p. 192.

Saalschuetz, Jos. L., Professor, Königsberg († 1863, acc. to Krehl), p. 92.

“Saint of the Lord,” appellative of Aaron, p. 59.

Sale, George († 1736), on Ezra, p. 154. The reader may also compare the passage quoted in J. M.

Rodwell, *The Koran*, 2d ed., London 1876.

Samaritan Version, rendering of Deut. xviii. 8b, p. 48; Deut. xxxiii. 9b, p. 61.

Samuel ministered to the Lord, p. 16; books of, make scant mention of priests and Levites, p. 80; Levite, pp. 94, 95; was made a Levite (Graf), p. 104, r. 2.

Sanctius, Caspar, Jesuit, Madrid († 1628), p. 108.

Sanhedrin, fourth treatise of the fourth Seder of the Mishnah, for its Gemara, p. 162, r. 1.

Schenkel, Daniel, Professor, Heidelberg, p. 135.

Schiller-Szinessy, S. M., author of the *Cambridge Catalogue of Hebrew MSS.*, pp. 191, 197.

Schultz, Fr. W., Professor, Breslau, p. 13.

Scientific proof not always adequate, p. 4.

Scribe, the prophet makes room for him (Kuenen), p. 139, r. 2; meaning of the word, p. 162.

Selden, John, English layman († 1654), opinion about Abiathar and Ahimelech, p. 108.

Septuagint (about 285-150 B.C.) translation of Deut. xviii. 8b, p. 48; Deut. xxvi. 12, 14, p. 52.

Seraiah, high priest, p. 89.

Shechem, priestly city, p. 93; perhaps the birth-place of Samuel, p. 95, r.

Silence, argument from, not conclusive, p. 81.

Simson, Professor, Königsberg, p. 192.

Siphre, or commentary on Num., Deut. (committed to writing

about the end of the 2d cent. A.D.), quoted, pp. 34, 44; refers Deut. xviii. 6a to the priests, p. 47.

Sirach, Jesus (190-170 B.C.), originally written in Hebrew, references—Aaron of the tribe of Levi, p. 26; Dathan, Abiram, and Korah, p. 64.

Smith, W. Robertson, Professor, Aberdeen, his estimate of the importance of our subject, p. 6.

Sons of Aaron called priests, p. 113; not mentioned by Malachi, p. 141.

Sotah, fifth treatise of the third Seder of the Mishnah, p. 160, r. 2.

Spinoza († 1677), interpretation of Deut. x. 10, p. 10.

Sprenger, A., Professor, Berne, the original meaning of Kohen (priest), p. 57.

Standing before the Lord, prerogative of the priests (Keil), p. 15; said only of the priests (Colenso), p. 46.

Steinschneider, Moritz, School Director, Berlin, pp. 192, 197.

Succah, sixth treatise of the second Seder of the Mishnah, for its Gemara on Deut. xviii. 6a, see p. 47.

Talmud = (Mishnah and Gemara), passages: Erachin 11a, interpretation of Deut. x. 8, p. 21, etc.

Targums—*Onkelos* (middle of first cent. A.D.), rendering of Deut. xxvi. 12, 14, p. 52.

First Jerusalem, or Pseudo-Jonathan (7-8 cent. A.D.), ren-

dering of Deut. xxvi. 12, 14, p. 53; Deut. xxxiii. 8, p. 59.

Second Jerusalem, or simply Jerusalem, rendering of Deut. xxvi. 12, 14, p. 52; Deut. xxxiii. 8, p. 59.

Thenius, Otto, Oberconsistorial-rath, Dresden (1876), p. 27.

Theologisch Tijdschrift, Amsterdam and Leyden, pp. 28, 57.

Thorah, final redaction of, p. 138, r. 3; does not always signify the entire Pentateuch, p. 140; meaning in Hos. iv. 6, p. 175.

Tirinus, a Jesuit († 1636), author of *Commentarius in universam S. Scripturam*, Lyons 1632 and 1702, interpretation of Deut. x. 8, pp. 10, 21.

Tithes, inheritance of the Levites, p. 36; character, pp. 37, 38; those in Deut. do not exclude the ones in Lev. and Num., pp. 38, 39; different kinds, p. 39; of the produce, p. 53; "all the tithe" explained, p. 54; kept in a storehouse, p. 140.

Tithing, the year of, pp. 52, 54.

Tostatus, Alphonsus, Bishop of Avila, Spain († 1454), on 2 Sam. viii. 17, p. 108.

Twelve Tribes did not arise from the twelve patriarchs (Kuenen), p. 2.

Ugolinus, Blasius, Venice (*Thesaurus*, in 34 fol. vols., 1744-1769), pp. 59, 108.

Uriah, high priest, p. 88.

Urim and Thummim, all Levites gifted with it (critics), p. 55; belongs to one individual, p. 56; belongs to priests in general (Kuenen), p. 57; intimated in Judges, p. 82.

Vatablus, Franc., Professor of Hebrew, Paris († 1547), interpretation of Deut. x. 8, pp. 10, 21; Deut. xxxiii. 8, p. 59.

Vatke, Wilhelm, Professor, Berlin, holds that the tribe of Levi is not descended from Levi, p. 28.

Volek, Wilhelm, Professor, Dorpat, p. 59, r. 2.

De Wette, W. M. Lebrecht, Basel († 1849), p. 182; style of Malachi's prophecies, p. 142; Isaiah, p. 183.

Zadok, sons of, termed Levites, p. 75; Zadok and Abiathar in 2 Sam., p. 75; name precedes Abiathar's, p. 87.

Zechariah manifests no antipathy to the priests, p. 137.

Zephaniah characterizes the leading personages of his time, p. 131.

Zotenberg, H., Librarian of the National Library, Paris, pp. 192, 197.

Zunz, Director of a seminary, Berlin, p. 195.

INDEX III.

REFERENCES TO THE SCRIPTURES.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis—			
iii. 14, 17,	61	xxix. 10-28,	65
vi. 9,	70	xxix. 12,	70
vi. 11, 13,	70	xxix. 14,	70
xii. 8,	19	xxix. 27, 28,	39
xviii. 20,	61	xxix. 37,	70
xix. 24, 25,	179	xxxi. 13,	70
xxi. 22,	10	xxxii. 26,	10
xxv. 26,	176	xxxii. 27,	60
xxix. 31,	135	xxxvi. 3,	71
xxxii. 12,	177	xxxix. 28,	71
xxxiv. 25, 30,	10		
xxxviii. 1,	10	Leviticus—	
xlix. 27,	70	i. 5, 7, 8, 11,	113
Exodus—		ii. 2,	113
iv. 14,	25, 27	ii. 3, 10,	30, 71
iv. 22, 23,	177	ii. 5, 6,	131
vi. 8,	70	ii. 13,	71
vi. 16,	110	iii. 1,	32
vii. 5,	70	iii. 2, 5,	113
xii. 12,	179	iv. 27, 35,	30, 32
xiv. 4, 18,	70	iv. 3,	71
xv. 1,	177	v. 10,	41
xv. 25,	133, 134	v. 12,	30
xvii. 2-7,	60	vi. 6,	32
xviii. 25, 26,	63	vi. 7,	113
xix. 3,	158	vi. 11,	30
xix. 5,	135	vi. 25-29,	32, 41, 71
xx. 22-26, xxi.-xxiii.,	3, 70, 164	vii. 1-7,	41, 71
xxi. 9,	41	vii. 9, 10,	32, 113
xxii. 29,	42	vii. 13,	179
xxiv. 5-8,	57	vii. 30, 35,	30
xxiv. 10,	70	vii. 34,	32, 39
xxviii. 1,	27, 113	viii. 8,	59, 87
xxviii. 4-39,	86, 110, 137	viii. 13, 24,	113
xxviii. 30,	59, 87	viii. 15,	70
		viii. 14-29,	65
		viii. 34,	41

	PAGE		PAGE		
ix. 3,	131	xvi. 1, 5, 16, 24, 25, 27, . .	64		
ix. 9, 12, 18,	113	xvi. 3-5,	59		
ix. 22,	20, 21	xvi. 9,	18		
x. 1, 16,	113	xvii. 2, 3,	29		
x. 6,	60	xvii. 5 (E. V. xvi. 40), . .	63		
x. 9,	71	xvii. 18 (E. V. 3), . .	27		
x. 10, 11,	137	xviii. 1,	29		
x. 11,	62, 63, 71	xviii. 2,	26, 29		
x. 12, 13,	30, 71	xviii. 1-5,	46		
xi.-xv.,	70, 71	xviii. 8, 31,	46		
xvi. 1,	113	xviii. 9,	71		
xvii. 7,	127	xviii. 12,	42		
xvii.-xxvi., 3, 7, 69, 71, 73, 74		xviii. 14,	71		
xxi. 1,	113	xviii. 15-18,	40, 41		
xxi. 6, 21,	30, 59	xviii. 20,	29, 35		
xxi. 11, 12,	60	xviii. 20-24,	28, 29, 34, 35,		
xxiv. 9,	30		36, 160		
xxv. 14, 25, 27, 28, 29, 50,	48	xviii. 21, 24, 26, 28,	36, 37, 53		
xxv. 24-32,	136	xix. 11,	71		
xxv. 32, 33,	51	xx. 12, 13,	60		
xxv. 47,	50	xxiii. 19,	178		
xxvi. 12, 13,	72	xxv. 3,	178		
xxvi. 15,	125	xxv. 7-13,	84		
xxvi. 31,	126, 179	xxv. 12, 13,	27		
xxvi. 41,	73	xxvi. 62,	29		
xxvii. 30-32,	37, 53	xxvii. 21,	82, 87		
 Numbers—					
ii. 34,	41	xxix. 15,	159		
iii. 2,	113	xxxv. 2,	48		
iii. 3,	113	 Deuteronomy—			
iii. 4,	75	i. 9,	10		
iii. 6,	16	iv. 10,	140		
iii. 10,	98	iv. 14,	158		
iii. 31,	13	viii. 15,	178		
iii.-iv.,	10	ix. 8-21,	10		
iv. 15,	13	x. 6,	58		
vi. 10,	71	x. 8,	9, 10, 12, 15, 17,		
vi. 24-26,	20, 21		18, 19, 20, 21		
vii. 9,	14	x. 9,	28, 33, 35		
ix. 3, 12,	41	x. 12,	131		
x. 17,	12	xi. 6,	63, 64		
xiv. 30,	70	xii. 5, 14,	26		
		xii. 6, 11, 13, 14, 26,	31		

	PAGE		PAGE
xii. 12,	29	iii. 3, 6, 13, 14, 17,	14, 89
xii. 15,	43		90, 115
xii. 17,	37, 39, 40	vi. 4,	90
xii. 18, 19,	49, 50	vi. 6,	14
xiv. 22, 23,	37	vi. 16,	89
xiv. 22-27,	39	viii. 31,	176
xiv. 27-29,	29, 39, 49, 51, 53	viii. 33,	14, 20, 23, 89, 115, 205
xiv. 28,	54	xiii. 14, 33,	29, 31, 34, 36, 91
xvi. 2, 10, 11, 13, 14,	5, 38 49, 50	xiii. 19,	89
xvii. 9, 11,	62, 63, 115, 197	xiv. 1,	83, 89
xvii. 12,	15	xvii. 4,	83, 89
xvii. 15-17,	5	xviii. 1, 10,	63
xvii. 18,	115, 198	xviii. 7,	36, 91
xviii. 1,	22, 29, 30, 31, 33, 35, 37, 42, 199	xix. 51,	63, 83, 89
xviii. 2,	29, 33, 39	xxi. 1,	63, 83, 89
xviii. 3,	31, 41, 44	xxi. 3, 4,	26, 85, 91, 98
xviii. 5,	26	xxi. 16,	96
xviii. 6, 7,	15, 47, 93	xxi. 18,	136
xviii. 8,	49	xxi. 19,	114
xviii. 18,	62	xxi. 21,	95
xxi. 5,	15, 19, 20, 63	xxii. 13, 30, 31,	84
xxiv. 8,	62, 115, 200	xxii. 13-32,	89
xxvi. 12, 14,	49, 51, 52, 178	xxiii. 6,	176
xxvii. 7,	31	xxiv. 15,	127
xxvii. 9, 12, 14,	20, 23, 29, 115	xxiv. 33,	89
xxvii. 30-32,	37	xxxiv. 33,	84
xxviii. 43, 44,	50	Judges—	
xxviii.-xxx.,	185	i. 1,	82
xxix. 17, 20,	26	ii. 11-19,	93
xxix. 28,	159	iii. 7,	93
xxx. 9,	10, 11, 12, 176	iv. 1,	93
xxx. 25,	10, 11, 12, 13	vi. 1,	93
xxxiii. 8, 9,	56, 59	viii. 27,	86
xxxiii. 10,	64	x. 6,	93
xxxiii. 8-11,	55, 57	xiii. 1,	93
xxxiii. 9, 10,	60	xvii. 2,	92
xxxiii. 19,	31	xvii. 5,	86, 89
Joshua—		xvii. 7,	92
iii. 3,	202	xviii. 30, 31,	89, 93
		xix. 1,	92, 93
		xix. 3,	93

	PAGE		PAGE
xix. 18,	93	vi. 14,	86
xx. 28,	57	vi. 17, 18,	20, 103
		viii. 17,	87, 90, 107, 108
		viii. 18,	58, 90
1 Samuel—		xv. 24,	94
i. 3-9,	50, 89	xv. 27, 35,	75, 90
i. 11,	95	xv. 29,	14
ii. 11,	17	xvii. 15,	90
ii. 12-17, 28, 29,	89	xix. 11,	75, 90
ii. 13-16,	57	xx. 25,	90
ii. 18,	16, 86	xx. 26,	90
ii. 27,	27	xxiv. 18,	103
ii. 28,	26, 31, 57		
iii. 35,	89		
ii. 36,	75	1 Kings—	
iii. 5,	17	i. 7-45,	90
iii. 15,	17	i. 9,	43
iv. 4,	14	i. 19,	88
v. 5,	90	ii. 22-35,	90
vi. 2,	90	ii. 26,	96, 97
vi. 9, 12, 15,	96	ii. 27, 35,	75, 88, 107
vi. 14, 15,	57, 90, 94	ii. 35,	87
vii. 1,	105	iv. 4, 5,	88, 90
viii. 5, 7, 19,	178	v. 11 (E. V. iv. 31),	105
viii. 15, 17,	39	v. 19 (E. V. v. 5),	103
xiii. 9,	103	viii. 3-6,	14, 90, 97, 114,
xiv. 3, 19, 36,	75, 86, 90		116, 227
xiv. 34, 37,	57	viii. 65,	24
xiv. 35,	90	ix. 25,	103
xxi. 1-9,	90, 94	xii. 31, 32,	90, 98
xxii. 9, 20,	75	xiii. 2, 33,	90, 98
xxii. 10,	57	xv. 5,	59
xxii. 11, 17, 18-21,	86, 90, 94	xix. 21,	43
xxii. 17-19,	83		
xxii. 20,	87		
xxiii. 9, 10,	87, 90	2 Kings—	
xxviii. 6,	87	x. 11, 19,	90
xxviii. 24,	43	xi. 4,	88
xxx. 7, 8,	87, 90	xi. 9, 10, 15,	90
		xii. 2,	88, 90
2 Samuel—		xii. 3 (E. V. 2),	62
vi. 13,	12	xii. 4-6, 8, 16,	90
		xii. 11 (E. V. 10),	111

	PAGE		PAGE
xiv. 1-20,	169	2 Chronicles—	
xv. 32, 38,	169	ii. 3 (E. V. 4),	103
xvi. 2,	88	v. 6,	103
xvi. 11,	88	v. 5, 7,	12, 13, 14, 97, 115, 116, 221
xvi. 10,	90, 130	viii. 12, 13,	103
xvii. 27,	62, 90	ix. 29,	169, 173
xxii. 8,	88	xi. 13, 14,	51, 98, 117
xxii. 10-14,	90	xii. 15,	169, 173
xxiii. 4,	89, 111	xiii. 9, 10,	113
xxiii. 8, 9,	76	xiii. 9-11,	98
xxiii. 24, 25,	90	xiii. 10, 11,	64
xxiii. 25,	176	xiii. 22,	173
xxv. 18-21,	89, 90, 111, 136	xvi. 11,	174
1 Chronicles—		xvi. 21,	168
ii. 6,	104	xvii. 7-9,	62
v. 27-29 (E. V. vi. 1-3),	26	xviii. 2,	43
v. 30-40 (E. V. vi. 4-14), 106, 108		xix. 11,	111
vi. 7-13 (E. V. 22-28),	94, 104	xx. 34,	168
vi. 34-38 (E. V. 49-52), 106, 112		xxiii. 6,	17
ix. 1,	168	xxiii. 18,	115, 116, 176, 225
ix. 1,	168	xxiv. 3, 6, 31,	107
ix. 2,	115, 116, 220	xxiv. 5,	229
xv. 2,	13	xxiv. 11,	111
xv. 11, 12,	107, 118	xxiv. 27,	169, 174
xv. 15,	15	xxv. 26,	168
xv. 26,	15	xxvi. 18,	65, 113
xv. 27,	86	xxvi. 20,	111
xvi. 2,	20, 103	xxvii. 7,	168, 169, 174
xvi. 4,	19	xxviii. 26,	168, 174
xvi. 37,	107	xxix. 4, 5, 11, 12,	17, 46, 117
xviii. 15, 16,	107, 108	xxix. 16,	18
xviii. 17,	58	xxix. 21,	113
xxi. 18,	103	xxix. 25,	170
xxiii. 13,	18, 19, 20, 21, 112	xxx. 16,	176
xxiii. 30,	117	xxx. 18,	168
xxiii. 31,	65	xxx. 27,	20, 115, 225
xxiv. 1-5,	75	xxxi. 2,	46, 117
xxiv. 3, 6,	75	xxxi. 3,	46
xxiv. 6,	108	xxxi. 6,	53
xxiv. 1-19,	107	xxxi. 10,	111
xxix. 21,	103	xxxi. 11,	141
xxix. 29,	173	xxxi. 19,	113

	PAGE		PAGE
xxxii. 32,	168, 174	cvi. 16,	59, 64
xxxiii. 18,	169	cxxxv. 19, 20,	19
xxxiv. 9,	111		
xxxv. 3,	18, 62	Proverbs—	
xxxv. 8, 18,	228	xxi. 27,	126
xxxv. 14,	113		
xxxvi. 8,	168		
		Isaiah—	
Ezra—		i. 1,	169
i. 5,	227	i. 7,	73
ii. 62,	75	i. 10,	176
iii. 2,	176	xix.,	129
iii. 12,	228	xxviii. 7,	130
vii. 5,	111, 112	xxxiv. 6,	43
vii. 6,	158, 176	xxxvii. 2,	130
vii. 10,	158, 162	xl.-lxvi.,	182, 187
x. 5,	24, 115, 213	xlix. 13-23,	186
		lvi. 9,	188
		lx. 7,	48
Nehemiah—		lxi. 6,	16
iii. 1, 20,	111	lxvi. 20-24,	186
viii. 1,	176	lxvi. 21,	130, 205
viii. 9,	62		
ix. 5,	19	Jeremiah—	
x. 28, 35,	24	i. 1,	97, 136
x. 29, 35,	115	ii. 20,	72
x. 38,	141	ii. 26,	132
x. 39,	113	iii. 6-11,	123
xi. 3,	228	iv. 9,	132
xi. 20,	24, 115	vi. 19,	132
xii. 1,	229	vii. 21,	135
xii. 23,	160	vii. 22, 23,	72, 133
xii. 44,	46	ix. 25 (E. V. 26),	73
xiii. 12,	141	xi. 4,	72, 133
xiii. 23,	138	xvii. 24-26,	132, 136
		xviii. 18,	62
Psalms—		xxx. 10,	188
lxxxii. 8,	60	xxx. 22,	72
lxxxviii. 1,	105	xxxii. 14, 32,	132, 136
lxxxix. 1,	105	xxxii. 6-12,	51
xcix. 6,	65	xxxii. 32,	132

	PAGE		PAGE
xxxiii. 14-26,	135	Daniel—	
xxxiii. 18,	212	ix. 11,	176
xxxiii. 21, 22,	16		
xxxiv. 13,	133	Hosea—	
xlvi. 10,	43	i. 2,	123
lii. 24,	136	i. 10,	177
Ezekiel—		ii. 15, 17,	177
i. 26,	70	iv. 1-3,	61
viii. 1,	73	iv. 6,	128
viii. 17,	70	iv. 10,	177
x. 1,	70	vi. 6,	128, 134
xi. 20,	72	vi. 9,	128
xiv. 1,	73	ix. 10,	178
xiv. 14, 20,	70	xi. 1,	177
xvi. 8-48,	123	xi. 9,	178
xx. 1,	73	xii. 4, 5 (E. V. 3, 4),	176
xx. 6, 15, 23, 28, 42,	70	xiii. 5,	178
xx. 12, 20,	70		
xx. 23, 24,	127	Joel—	
xxii. 27,	70	i. 13,	16
xxx. 19,	70	ii. 17,	16
xxxiii. 30,	73		
xxxiv. 3,	43	Amos—	
xxxiv. 27,	72	iv. 10,	179
xxxvi. 7,	70	v. 21, 22, 24, 25,	126
xxxvi. 28,	72	v. 26,	126
xxxix. 17,	43		
xl. 46,	15	Micah—	
xlii. 24,	71	iii. 11,	62
xlii. 18-27,	70, 136, 213	vi. 6-8,	131
xliv.,	6		
xliv. 7,	73	Zephaniah—	
xliv. 10,	74, 76	iii. 3, 4,	131
xliv. 11,	18		
xliv. 12,	70	Haggai—	
xliv. 15, 16,	15, 76, 136, 214	ii. 11,	137
xliv. 17-31,	71	ii. 11-13,	62
xliv. 23,	62		
xliv. 25,	114	Zechariah—	
xliv. 27, 28,	34	iii. 5,	137
xlv. 4, 5,	16		
xlvii. 14,	70		

	PAGE		PAGE
vi. 11,	137	Sirach—	
xii. 13,	138	xlv. 6,	26
xiii. 3,	119	xlv. 18,	64
Malachi—		Matthew—	
i. 6, 7, 8, 10, 13,	143	i,	110
ii. 4, 5,	26, 27	Luke—	
ii. 4-8,	141	xiv. 26,	135
ii. 7,	62, 140	Acts—	
ii. 10-16,	138	viii. 30-35,	184
iii. 1-4,	143	1 Peter—	
iii. 8-10,	138	i. 10-12,	184
iii. 10,	140		
iii. 22,	176		
iv. 4,	140		

INDEX IV.

HEBREW AND CHALDEE WORDS.

אַחֲזָה	34	וַיֹּאמֶר	186
אִישׁ חָסִיד	59, 61	וְלֹכֶדֶן הַלְוִימָד	190
אִישָׁה	30, 32	וְלֹכֶל הַעֲלוֹת עַלְוָת	65
אָשָׁם	31, 32	לִיהְוָה	
אַתְּ-אַרְאֵן וְנוּ'	11	וִשְׁרָת	46
בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֲנִים	113	זָבֵחַ	31, 43
בָּרָךְ	19, 20	זָבֵחַ זָבֵחַ	42
בְּסֶפֶר מְנֻהָה	212	חֹזֶה	41
גָּרִים	50	חָלֵק	34
הַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִימָד	13, 190	חַטָּאת	31, 32
הַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִימָד בְּלִי	25	חָסִיד	59, 60
וְהַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִימָד	190	כָּהֵן	57
וּבָא	46	כָּהֵן הַנְּדוּלִי	111
		כָּהֵן הַרְאִישׁ	111
		כָּלִיל	31

	PAGE		PAGE
לְבָלֶר	173	סּוֹפֶר מַהְיָר	162
לִיתְ דִּסְמִינְק	190	סְפִרְתַּת הַמְלָכִים לִיהוֹרָה	174
לְכָהָנִים הַלְּלִיִּם	190	וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל	
לְכָהָנִים לְלִוִּים	190	סְפִרְתַּת מַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	174
לְגַנּוֹן וְלְבַנְגַּנוֹן עַד-עוֹלָם	159	וַיְהִוָּה	
לִשְׁרָתוֹ	18	סְפִרְתַּת תַּלְמִידָא	162
מִאֵת מִכְרִיהם	49		
כְּנָה	212	עֲבָדִי	188
מִכְר	49	עַלְהָה	31
מִמְכָר	48	עַלְהָה אֲבֹת	49
מִנְחָת סָלָת	31	עַלְרָצָן	48
מַעַשֵּׂר מִן הַמְעֵשָׂר	39		
מַעַשֵּׂר עַנִּי	39	צְדִיק	70
מַעַשֵּׂר רָאשָׂון	39		
מַעַשֵּׂר שְׁנִי	39	קְדוּשָׁה יִשְׂרָאֵל	183
מִפְּנֵי נְבִיאָה	189	קְטָלָה	43
מִשְׁהָ נְבִיא סְפִרְתָּה	162	קְרָא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה	19
דִּיְשָׁרָאֵל		קְרָבֵן	31, 32
מִשְׁרָתִי אֱלֹהִינוּ	16		
מִשְׁרָתִי הַבַּיִת	16	שְׁוֹק	41
מִשְׁרָתִי הַמִּקְדָּשׁ	16	שְׁלָמִים	31, 32
נְבִיאָה	57	שְׁנַת הַמְעֵשָׂר	52
נֶדֶר	31		
נְשָׁאִים	11	תּוֹרָה	157
נְחָלָה	34	תְּקִנּוֹת	157

THE END.

In demy 8vo, price 4s. 6d.,

OUTLINES
OF
HEBREW GRAMMAR.

BY
GUSTAVUS BICKELL, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT INNSBRUCK.

Revised by the Author, and Annotated by the Translator,
SAMUEL IVES CURTISS, JR.,
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY, LEIPZIG.

WITH A LITHOGRAPHIC TABLE OF SEMITIC CHARACTERS
BY DR. J. EUTING.

‘ As the preface informs us, this book is not intended as a Grammar for beginners. It is a scientific discussion of Hebrew as one of the descendants from an ancient Semitic language,—a language more nearly approximated to the Arabic; a discussion suited to those who are acquainted with Hebrew, and as well to students of comparative philology. After a view of the history of the language, the Author treats of its phonology; of the formation of stems; of the formation of words, and of syntax.

‘ The value of the English edition is greatly enhanced by the table of Semitic characters. Dr. JULIUS EUTING, of the Library at Strassburg, had composed a table which scholars pronounced unexcelled.

This table he himself enlarged and improved; and, moreover, Dr. CURTISS secured for it, from the Egyptian scholar Professor EBERS, of Leipzig, the Egyptian letters. Probably it is what its forerunner was said to be, the best table in existence. . . . Professor FRANZ DELITZSCH inserted three paragraphs upon the accents. . . . Dr. CURTISS has not only added many learned notes to the translation, but has also paid great attention to correcting and completing historical dates and items of literature.'—Dr. CASPAR RENE GREGORY, Leipzig, in the *New York Observer*.

'I fully appreciate the reasons which led you, with the co-operation of the Author as well as of my friends DELITZSCH and EUTING, to give this pregnant little work to the English-speaking world. Perhaps I might have contributed something towards it, and this is still possible in case of a second edition.'—Professor Dr. H. L. FLEISCHER, Leipzig.

'I shall be very glad to recommend it to my students.'—Professor Dr. LUDOLPH KREHL, Leipzig.

The German original is used by LIC. HERMANN GUTHE, of the University of Leipzig, as the basis of his lectures to the members of his Hebrew Grammatical Society, and the English translation has been recommended by him to his English-speaking students.

'The little book will certainly be used with much profit in America, and the excellent table of characters makes it valuable for us Germans.'—Professor Dr. E. RIEHM, Halle.

'Your translation of BICKELL reaches me in the nick of time, as I mean to lecture on Comparative Grammar next term, and shall be able to recommend it to my students.'—Professor WILLIAM WRIGHT, LL.D., Cambridge.

'The explanation of Hebrew forms by reference to a more primitive condition of the language, which throws so much light on the apparent darkness of the paradigms by which students are puzzled, was not carried through any Grammar accessible to the English reader till the appearance of Mr. POOLE's translation of LAND's "Principles of Hebrew Grammar." Unfortunately this work has serious defects as a manual for learners; and the student who wishes to get a clear and brief conspectus of the genesis of the Hebrew forms will probably do

better to procure Mr. CURTISS's translation of BICKELL's excellent "Outlines of Hebrew Grammar." . . . The latter has a very admirable table of Semitic characters by EUTING, which is superior to anything of the kind previously accessible.'—Professor W. R. SMITH, Aberdeen

'It is really *multum in parvo*. I have read over some portions of it, and find it extremely original, interesting, and valuable in its treatment of the language.'—Professor JAMES G. MURPHY, LL.D., T.C.D., Belfast.

'I have read the book with much interest. It is the most scientific statement of Hebrew forms that I have seen, and is characterized by soundness and acuteness. I think that it will make a good text-book. I have been accustomed to give my senior class some of these details, but so full and good a statement is welcome.'—C. H. Toy, D.D., LL.D., Greenville, S.C., U.S.A.

'Through the translation of these Outlines, therefore, Dr. CURTISS has justly won a claim to the gratitude of his countrymen. . . . This translation has the value of a new edition. The Author has revised and improved the little book throughout. The sections on the accents, which furnish an uncommonly concise, clear, and very precise representation, are from the pen of FRANZ DELITZSCH; and the very complete table of Egyptian (this from EBERS), and above all of the Semitic characters, comes from the well-known master-hand of EUTING, —not to forget the many interesting and fine notes which the translator has added.'—Professor Dr. LUDWIG DIESTEL, Tübingen, in the *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*.

'BICKELL's Grammar is among the best designed for the use of students which we possess.'—Professor Dr. BERNHARD STADE, Giessen, in the *Jenaer Literaturzeitung*.

'Dr. EUTING's table is in a high degree an ornament to the book, and should be alone sufficient to secure it a wide circulation.'—Professor Dr. E. KANTSCH, Basel, in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*.

'Those who may have read BOPP's "Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Tongues," can understand the kind of service which Professor BICKELL has attempted for the Hebrew. As Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, etc., flowed from a common fountain, BICKELL assumes

that there was a source from which the various dialects of the Semitic race have sprung. . . . The Author's ability is conspicuous; his ground hypothesis not improbable; his application of it to the phenomena of the Hebrew tongue is exceedingly complete and ingenious.'—Rev. A. ROBB, D.D., in the *Edinburgh Daily Review*.

'The results of Dr. BICKELL's researches cannot fail to be of the highest interest to all students of Semitic philology. . . . The value of the work is clearly recognised in Germany, and is beginning to be recognised in England and America.'—*British American Presbyterian*.

'The translator's work is scholarly and thorough; he has entered into the spirit of the Author, and written what bears no marks of being a translation.'—*The Evening Post*, New York.

'Professor BICKELL long since established his reputation as an eminent Semitic philologist, and is especially esteemed as an editor, commentator, and translator of Syriac works. That he is also a master of the science of Hebrew Grammar was amply proved by his "Grundriss der Hebräischen Grammatik," which he published in 1869, and of which the book before us is a translation.'—*The Nation*, New York.

The limits of this circular do not allow of quotations from Dr. REUSCH's *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, *The Academy*, *The Presbyterian*, *The Advance*, etc., which contained favourable notices of the translation.

With a Lithographic Table, 8vo, 1s.,

THE NAME MACHABEE.

BY

SAMUEL IVES CURTISS, JR.,

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY, LEIPSIG.

‘We recommend the reading of this dissertation to any one who will become convinced that even the smallest and most minute point is sufficient as a test of a scientific spirit and of sound knowledge. Although about nothing else than the “Name Machabee,” it is a fine testimonial of the scientific method as well as of the thorough learning of the Author.’—Professor Dr. E. SCHÜRER, in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*.

‘The Author, in our opinion, has proved that the recently almost universally accepted fundamental form with **מַקְבִּי** with **מַקְבִּי** is highly doubtful, and the derivation from **מַקְבִּי** very improbable. He has advanced a very interesting explanation of the name, which seems to us to be better than all other attempted etymologies. . . . The dissertation was prepared with the greatest industry, with the use of all applicable materials, and in its systematic outline is a pattern of all such special investigations.’—Count Dr. BANDISSIN, Professor at Strassburg, in the *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*.

In two volumes demy 8vo, price 21s.,

GROWTH OF THE SPIRIT OF CHRISTIANITY, FROM THE FIRST CENTURY TO THE DAWN OF THE LUTHERAN ERA.

BY THE

REV. GEORGE MATHESON, M.A., B.D.,
AUTHOR OF 'AIDS TO THE STUDY OF GERMAN THEOLOGY.'

CONTENTS.

CHAP.

1. The Originality and Oldness of the Christian Religion.
2. Preparation for the Cross.
3. The Ingathering.
4. Birthplace of the Spirit of Christianity.
5. Transition from Infancy into Childhood.
6. The Hopes of Childhood.
7. Breaking up of Home Associations.
8. Extinction of Home Associations.
9. Independent Speculations of the Child-Life.
10. Influence of Worldly Contact.
11. Moral Struggles of the Child-Life.
12. Fluctuations of the Struggle.
13. Decline of the Ideal.
14. The Child-Life under the World's Tuition.
15. Last Efforts of the Self-Will.
16. The Reconciliation completed.
17. Close of the Child-Life.
18. Characteristics of the New Period.
19. First Practical Influences of the Christian Spirit.
20. First Intellectual Stage of the School-Life.

CHAP.

21. Protestant Influence of Mohammedianism.
22. First Revolt of the School-Life.
23. The Church under New Guardianship.
24. The Church become the World.
25. Revival of Aspiration.
26. First Glimmerings of the Romantic Age.
27. Expanding of Christian Intelligence.
28. Second Revolt of the School-Life.
29. Last Triumph of the Temporal Papacy.
30. Search for a Rule of Conduct.
31. Discovery of a New Well-Spring.
32. Decline of the Temporal Papacy.
33. Third Revolt of the School-Life.
34. Close of the School-Life; the Negative Reformation completed.
35. The Independence of Youth.
36. The Moral Preparation of Youth.
37. The Intellectual Preparation of Youth in its relation to Art and the Reformation.
38. The Dawn of a New Day.

'This work is thoroughly original in the highest sense. The main thought of the book is at once simple and profound. . . . To say that the work is fascinating, high in its literary merit, beautiful in its condensed descriptive power, strong in its sure grasp of principles, striking in its extensive and profound historical knowledge, is to say but little of what we feel to be due to the writer and his work. He has the vivid historical imagination which enables him to live in the past, and he has the artistic power of reproducing the thought and life of former generations.'—*Daily Review*.

Just published, Second Edition, demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.,

THE TRAINING OF THE TWELVE; OR,

EXPOSITION OF PASSAGES IN THE GOSPELS EXHIBITING
THE TWELVE DISCIPLES OF JESUS UNDER
DISCIPLINE FOR THE APOSTLESHIP.

BY

A. B. BRUCE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

‘Here we have a really great book on an important, large, and attractive subject—a book full of loving, wholesome, profound thoughts about the fundamentals of Christian faith and practice.’—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review*.

‘It is some five or six years since this work first made its appearance, and now that a second edition has been called for, the author has taken the opportunity to make some alterations which are likely to render it still more acceptable. Substantially, however, the book remains the same, and the hearty commendation with which we noted its first issue applies to it at least as much now.’—*Rock*.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

In one volume 8vo, price 12s.,

THE HUMILIATION OF CHRIST

IN ITS PHYSICAL, ETHICAL, AND OFFICIAL ASPECTS.

(SIXTH SERIES OF CUNNINGHAM LECTURES.)

‘These lectures are able and deep-reaching to a degree not often found in the religious literature of the day; withal, they are fresh and suggestive. . . . The learning and the deep and sweet spirituality of this discussion will commend it to many faithful students of the truth as it is in Jesus.’—*Congregationalist*.

‘We have not for a long time met with a work so fresh and suggestive as this of Professor Bruce. . . . We do not know where to look at our English Universities for a treatise so calm, logical, and scholarly.’—*English Independent*.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 12s.,

THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE.

BY ALFRED CAVE, B.A.

BOOK I.—PREPARATORY.

PART I. THE PATRIARCHAL DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE.

PART II. THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE.

PART III. THE POST-MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE.

BOOK II.—PLEROMATIC.

‘We have nothing but praise for its clearness, its method, its thoroughness, and its tolerance. We most warmly commend Mr. Cave’s book to the study of the clergy, who will find it full of suggestiveness and instruction.’—*English Churchman*.

‘A thoroughly able and erudite book, from almost every page of which something may be learned. The author’s method is exact and logical, the style perspicuous and forcible—sometimes, indeed, almost epigrammatic; and as a careful attempt to ascertain the teaching of the Scripture on an important subject, it cannot fail to be interesting even to those whom it does not convince.’—*Watchman*.

‘We wish to draw particular attention to this new work on the deeply-important subject of sacrifice. . . . If we can induce our readers not only to glance through the book, but to read every line with thoughtful care, as we have done, we shall have earned their gratitude.’—*Church Bells*.

‘It would be difficult to point to any modern theological work in English which reveals more abundant and patient scholarship, a more vigorous and comprehensive view of a great question. The subject is large and the literature enormous, the lines of investigation are numerous and intricate; but the author of the volume before us has displayed a fine mastery of voluminous material, and, after examining the scriptural phraseology in its historical development, positive declarations, and immediate inferences therefrom, he draws out his conclusions with great care, and contrasts them with views of a more speculative kind which have been advanced by distinguished scholars in Germany and England. The argument of the volume is sustained by logical compactness, lucidity of style, and considerable learning; it is a guide to the opinions of the principal writers on every part of the subject, and is pervaded by a fine spiritual tone.’—*Evangelical Review*.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 6s.,

A TREATISE ON THE INSPIRATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

BY

CHARLES ELLIOTT, D.D.,

Professor of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of the North-West, Chicago, Illinois.

Just published, in one large 8vo volume, Eighth English Edition,
price 15s.,

A TREATISE ON THE GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK,

Regarded as the Basis of New Testament Exegesis.

Translated from the German [of Dr. G. B. Winer].

With large additions and full Indices. Second Edition. Edited by Rev. W. F. MOULTON, D.D., one of the New Testament Translation Revisers.

The additions by the Editor are very large, and will tend to make this great work far more useful and available for *English* students than it has hitherto been. The Indices have been greatly enlarged, but with discrimination, so as to be easily used. Altogether, the Publishers do not doubt that this will be the Standard Grammar of New Testament Greek.

‘We gladly welcome the appearance of Winer’s great work in an English translation, and must strongly recommend it to all who wish to attain to a sound and accurate knowledge of the language of the New Testament. We need not say it is *the* Grammar of the New Testament. It is not only superior to all others, but *so* superior as to be by common consent the one work of reference on the subject. No other could be mentioned with it.’—*Literary Churchman*.

DR. LUTHARDT'S WORKS.

In three handsome crown 8vo volumes, price 6s. each.

'We do not know any volumes so suitable in these times for young men entering on life, or, let us say, even for the library of a pastor called to deal with such, than the three volumes of this series. We commend the whole of them with the utmost cordial satisfaction. They are altogether quite a specialty in our literature.'—*Weekly Review*.

Apologetic Lectures on the Fundamental Truths of Christianity. *Fourth Edition.* By C. E. LUTHARDT, D.D., Leipzig.

Apologetic Lectures on the Saving Truths of Christianity. *Third Edition.*

Apologetic Lectures on the Moral Truths of Christianity. *Second Edition.*

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 9s.,

St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel. By Professor C. E. LUTHARDT, Author of 'Fundamental Truths of Christianity,' etc. Translated and the Literature enlarged by C. R. GREGORY, Leipzig.

'A work of thoroughness and value. The translator has added a lengthy appendix, containing a very complete account of the literature bearing on the controversy respecting this Gospel. The indices which close the volume are well ordered, and add greatly to its value.'—*Guardian*.

Crown 8vo, 5s.,

Luthardt, Kahnis, and Brückner.
The Church: Its Origin, its History, and its Present Position.

'A comprehensive review of this sort, done by able hands, is both instructive and suggestive.'—*Record*.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 9s.,

HIPPOLYTUS AND CALLISTUS;
OR,

**THE CHURCH OF ROME IN THE FIRST HALF OF
THE THIRD CENTURY.**

By J. J. IGN. VON DÖLLINGER.

Translated, with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices,

By ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A.,
MASTER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DURHAM.

'That this learned and laborious work is a valuable contribution to ecclesiastical history, is a fact of which we need hardly assure our readers. The name of the writer is a sufficient guarantee of this. It bears in all its pages the mark of that acuteness which, even more than the unwearyed industry of its venerated author, is a distinguishing feature of whatever proceeds from the pen of Dr. Döllinger.'—*John Bull.*

'We are impressed with profound respect for the learning and ingenuity displayed in this work. The book deserves perusal by all students in ecclesiastical history. It clears up many points hitherto obscure, and reveals features in the Roman Church at the beginning of the third century which are highly instructive.'—*Athenaeum.*

Just published, in two volumes demy 8vo, price 12s. each,

A HISTORY OF THE COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH.

From the Original Documents.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF
C. J. HEFELE, D.D., BISHOP OF ROTTENBURG.

VOL. I. (*Second Edition*) TO A.D. 325.

By Rev. PREBENDARY CLARK.

VOL. II. A.D. 326 TO 429.

By H. N. OXENHAM, M.A.

'This careful translation of Hefele's Councils.'—Dr. PUSEY.

'A thorough and fair compendium, put in a most accessible and intelligent form.'—*Guardian.*

'A work of profound erudition, and written in a most candid spirit. The book will be a standard work on the subject.'—*Spectator.*

'The most learned historian of the Councils.'—*Père Gratry.*

'We cordially commend Hefele's Councils to the English student.'—*John Bull.*

In three volumes 8vo, price 31s. 6d.,

A COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

BY F. GODET, D.D.,

Professor of Theology, Neuchatel.

'This work forms one of the battlefields of modern inquiry, and is itself so rich in spiritual truth, that it is impossible to examine it too closely; and we welcome this treatise from the pen of Dr. Godet. We have no more competent exegete; and this new volume shows all the learning and vivacity for which the author is distinguished.'—*Freeman*.

Just published, in two volumes 8vo, price 21s.,

A COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE.

BY F. GODET,

Doctor and Professor of Theology, Neuchatel.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SECOND FRENCH EDITION.

'Marked by clearness and good sense, it will be found to possess value and interest as one of the most recent and copious works specially designed to illustrate this Gospel.'—*Guardian*.

KEIL AND DELITZSCH'S COMMENTARIES ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

10s. 6d. each volume.

PENTATEUCH, 3 VOLS.	(Keil.)
JOSHUA, JUDGES, AND RUTH, 1 VOL.	(Keil.)
SAMUEL, 1 VOL.	(Keil.)
KINGS, 1 VOL., AND CHRONICLES, 1 VOL.	(Keil.)
EZRA, NEHEMIAH, AND ESTHER, 1 VOL.	(Keil.)
JOB, 2 VOLS.	(Delitzsch.)
PSALMS, 3 VOLS.	(Delitzsch.)
PROVERBS, 2 VOLS.	(Delitzsch.)
ECCLESIASTES AND SONG OF SOLOMON, 1 VOL.	(Delitzsch.)
ISAIAH, 2 VOLS.	(Delitzsch.)
JEREMIAH AND LAMENTATIONS, 2 VOLS.	(Keil.)
EZEKIEL, 2 VOLS.	(Keil.)
DANIEL, 1 VOL.	(Keil.)
MINOR PROPHETS, 2 VOLS.	(Keil.)

'This series is one of great importance to the Biblical scholar; and as regards its general execution, it leaves little or nothing to be desired.'—*Edinburgh Review*.

Just published, price 7s. 6d.,

ON CHRISTIAN COMMONWEALTH.

Translated and Adapted (with the Revision of the Author)

From the German of

DR. HENRY J. W. THIERSCH.

'The work is thoughtful, earnest, and moderate in tone.'—*Scotsman.*

'In a rather thin octavo are discussed seventeen subjects, each one enough for a volume, yet the essays are neither shallow nor evasive; the writer is in earnest, and goes at once to the root of the matter. The style is singularly clear, and the language is concise, quite unlike what is often the German manner. A hundred quotations might be made, leaving a hundred bits equally good. This book deserves to reach a tenth edition.'—*Record.*

Just published, in demy 8vo, Third Edition, price 10s. 6d.,

MODERN DOUBT & CHRISTIAN BELIEF.

A SERIES OF APOLOGETIC LECTURES ADDRESSED TO
EARNEST SEEKERS AFTER TRUTH.

By THEODORE CHRISTLIEB, D.D.,

UNIVERSITY PREACHER AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT BONN.

Translated, with the Author's sanction, chiefly by the Rev. H. U. WEITBRECHT, Ph.D., and Edited by the Rev. T. L. KINGSBURY, M.A., Vicar of Easton Royal, and Rural Dean.

'We recommend the volume as one of the most valuable and important among recent contributions to our apologetic literature. . . . We are heartily thankful both to the learned author and to his translators.'—*Guardian.*

'All the fundamental questions connected with revealed religion are handled more or less fully. The volume shows throughout intellectual force and earnestness.'—*Athenaeum.*

'We express our unfeigned admiration of the ability displayed in this work, and of the spirit of deep piety which pervades it; and whilst we commend it to the careful perusal of our readers, we heartily rejoice that in those days of reproach and blasphemy, so able a champion has come forward to contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints.'—*Christian Observer.*

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 6s.,

SERMONS
FOR THE
CHRISTIAN YEAR.
ADVENT—TRINITY.

By PROFESSOR ROTHE.

TRANSLATED BY WILLIAM R. CLARK, M.A. OXON.,
PREBENDARY OF WELLS AND VICAR OF TAUVENTON.

‘The volume is rich in noble thoughts and wholesome lessons.’—*Watchman*.

Just published, in two vols. large crown 8vo, price 7s. 6d. each,
THE YEAR OF SALVATION.
WORDS OF LIFE FOR EVERY DAY.

A BOOK OF HOUSEHOLD DEVOTION.

BY J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, D.D.

‘A work of great value and interest. To the clergy these readings will be found full of suggestive hints for sermons and lectures; while for family reading or for private meditation they are most excellent. The whole tone of the work is thoroughly practical, and never becomes controversial.’—*Church Bells*.

‘The *very best* religious exposition for everyday use that has ever fallen in our way.’—*Bell's Weekly Messenger*.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 6s.,

M O S E S:
A BIBLICAL STUDY.

‘Our author has seized, as with the instinct of a master, the great salient points in the life and work of Moses, and portrayed the various elements of his character with vividness and skill. . . . The work will at once take its place among our ablest and most valuable expository and practical discourses.’—*Baptist Magazine*.

‘A volume full of valuable and suggestive thought, which well deserves and will amply repay careful perusal. We have read it with real pleasure.’—*Christian Observer*.

Just published, price 9s.,

S A I N T A U G U S T I N E.

A POEM IN EIGHT BOOKS.

BY THE LATE HENRY WARWICK COLE, Q.C.

With Prefatory Note by the Bishop-Suffragan of Nottingham.

'Written in sonorous and well-sustained verse. The testimony borne to the dignity and the value of the two sacraments and to the authority of the Scriptures, as the revelation of God, is, we consider, of special value, as coming from a learned and cultivated layman, of considerable repute at the bar, in an age of prevalent scepticism.'—*Church Bells*.

Recently published, in demy 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

THE MIRACLES OF OUR LORD IN RELATION TO MODERN CRITICISM.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF

F. L. STEINMEYER, D.D.,
Ordinary Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin.

'This work vindicates in a vigorous and scholarly style the sound view of miracles against the sceptical assaults of the time.'—*Princeton Review*.

In demy 8vo, price 6s.,

THE SERVANT OF JEHOVAH.

A Commentary, Grammatical and Critical, upon
Isaiah iii. 13—liii. 12.

WITH DISSERTATIONS UPON THE AUTHORSHIP OF ISAIAH XL.—LXVI.,
AND UPON THE MEANING OF EBED JEHOVAH.

BY WILLIAM URWICK, M.A.,
Of Trinity College, Dublin; Tutor in Hebrew, New College, London.

'This is a very able and seasonable contribution to biblical literature.'—*Watchman*.

'The commentary evinces the great ability, accurate and extensive scholarship, and admirable judgment of the author.'—*Weekly Review*.

Just published, price 5s.,

MESSIANIC PROPHECY: ITS ORIGIN, HISTORICAL CHARACTER, AND RELATION TO NEW TESTAMENT FULFILMENT.

BY DR. EDWARD RIEHM,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, HALLE.

Translated from the German, with the approbation of the Author,
BY THE REV. JOHN JEFFERSON.

'Undoubtedly original and suggestive, and deserving careful consideration.'—*Literary Churchman*.

'Its intrinsic excellence makes it a valuable contribution to our biblical literature.'—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review*.

'The product of a well-balanced mind, which is able to weigh conflicting theories and to assign them their due proportion.'—*English Independent*.

In demy 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

SERMONS TO THE NATURAL MAN.

BY WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D.D.,

AUTHOR OF 'A HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE,' ETC.

'These sermons are admirably suited to their purpose. Characterized by profound knowledge of divine truth, and presenting the truth in a chaste and attractive style, the sermons carry in their tone the accents of the solemn feeling of responsibility to which they owe their origin.'—*Weekly Review*.

In demy 8vo, price 12s.,

INTRODUCTION TO THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

BY PATON J. GLOAG, D.D.,

AUTHOR OF A 'CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE
ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.'

'A work of uncommon merit. He must be a singularly accomplished divine to whose library this book is not a welcome and valuable addition.'—*Watchman*.

'It will be found of considerable value as a handbook to St. Paul's Epistles. The dissertations display great thought as well as research. The author is fair, learned, and calm, and his book is one of worth.'—*Church Bells*.

In crown 8vo, Second Edition, price 4s.,

PRINCIPLES
OF
NEW TESTAMENT QUOTATION
ESTABLISHED AND APPLIED TO BIBLICAL SCIENCE.

BY REV. JAMES SCOTT, M.A., B.D.

‘This admirable treatise does not traverse in detail the forms and formulæ of New Testament quotation from the Old, nor enter with minuteness into the philological and theological discussion arising around many groups of these quotations—the author confines his attention to the *principles* involved in them. . . . An interesting discussion, vindicating the method thus analyzed, is followed by a very valuable summation of the argument in its bearing on the canon, the originality of the Gospels, the internal unity of Scripture, and the permanence of revelation.’—*British Quarterly Review*.

Recently published, in demy 8vo, price 9s.,

A CHRONOLOGICAL AND GEOGRAPHICAL
INTRODUCTION TO
THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

BY C. E. CASPARI.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, WITH ADDITIONAL NOTES, BY

M. J. EVANS, B.A.

Revised by the Author.

‘The work is handy and well suited for the use of the student. It gives him, in very reasonable compass and in well-digested forms, a great deal of information respecting the dates and outward circumstances of our Lord's life, and materials for forming a judgment upon the various disputed points arising out of them.’—*Guardian*.

‘An excellent and devout work. We can strongly recommend it.’—*Church Quarterly Review*.

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 5s.,

THE SYMBOLIC PARABLES
OF
THE CHURCH, THE WORLD, AND THE ANTICHRIST;
Being the Separate Predictions of the Apocalypse,
VIEWED IN THEIR RELATION TO THE GENERAL TRUTHS OF SCRIPTURE.

BY MRS. STEVENSON.

‘An excellent treatise, containing much clear thought, and written as intelligibly as the subject would permit. To students of prophecy the book ought to be an attractive one; and to every one who desires to have a clearer understanding of his Bible, it will give much valuable assistance.’—*Glasgow Herald*.

‘This is a sober, well-written, and instructive treatise on the Apocalypse. It is exceedingly suggestive, and the theory the author expounds holds well together. The key seems to fit every ward of the lock. This volume is worthy of the most serious consideration of all who take an interest in prophecy.’—*Daily Review*.

‘It is quite refreshing to meet with a treatise on the Book of Revelation like this, marked by good sense and reverence. Brief as it is, it throws more light on a difficult subject than many laboured tomes.’—*Methodist Recorder*.

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 4s.,

OUTLINES OF BIBLICAL PSYCHOLOGY.

BY J. T. BECK, D.D.,
PROF. ORD. THEOL., TÜBINGEN.

Translated from the Third Enlarged and Corrected German Edition, 1877.

‘In this little volume Dr. Beck has giveu us a valuable contribution to the study of this science.’—*Homiletic Quarterly*.

‘The smallness of the work should not lead to its being undervalued; it well deserves a place side by side with Delitzsch and Heard. . . . We do warmly recommend this volume as one of the most fresh and valuable contributions to theological literature of recent date.’—*Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*.

‘We quite endorse Bishop Ellicott's statement that, for many readers, Beck's will be found to be the most handy manual on the subject.’—*Church Bells*.

BS1196.5 .P7C92
The Levitical Priests; a contribution to

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00045 9919

